

THE DE BRISAY
ANALYTICAL
FRENCH METHOD.

A SCIENTIFIC SYSTEM OF ACQUIRING A THOROUGH
CONVERSATIONAL AND LITERARY
KNOWLEDGE OF

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

BY

CHARLES THÉOPHILE DE BRISAY, B.A.

*Author of the "Analytical Latin Method," and Principal of the "Académie De Brisay,"
Toronto, Canada.*

IN FOUR PARTS.

PART I.

AUTHOR'S EDITION.
TORONTO, CANADA.
1896.

Entered according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, by CHARLES T. DE BRISAY, at the Department of Agriculture.

PREFACE.

IT is nearly two years since the first edition of my "Analytical Latin Method" was published; and although at the time of publishing that work, I had every reason to feel assured it would be received by a large number of students and teachers, as a welcome relief from the tedious and absurd system of teaching Latin so long in use, I did not look forward to seeing the method so universally approved, nor to the showers of pleasing congratulations from so many persons, in whom it was natural to suppose a strong prejudice would exist against any new way of teaching so sacred a thing as the ancient classics.

It would not be true to say the method encountered no opposition and no prejudice. When an author claims as much for his method as I have done for mine, he must be prepared for incredulous smiles and sarcastic criticisms—and unless he is able to substantiate his claims by ready facts, he were wiser not to make them.

I still stand by the claim made two years ago for my Analytical Method—that Latin studied through it, presents few difficulties, and that a few weeks, or at the most, three months, is sufficient time in which to acquire a practical knowledge of Latin—and in repeating that claim to-day, I have the knowledge and assurance that it is voiced by almost every student of the ANALYTICAL METHOD.

But if the publication of that work has opened my eyes to the true feeling among students and teachers regarding the old method of teaching the classics, it has also made clear the fact that there exists almost as great a dissatisfaction with the present methods of teaching modern languages.

It is therefore, at the request of hundreds of students, that I have applied the ANALYTICAL METHOD to French—and this I have done with a double pleasure, because of modern languages, French is the one I love most and know best.

In the introduction to this volume (which is itself but an introduction to the course), a fair explanation of the method will be found. I would just add here one word for those over-practical people who might

feel they were wasting valuable time, if they were not in the very first lesson introduced to steam-boats and railway stations. We will deal with steam-boats, etc., in their proper place; to begin with such subjects is to begin at the wrong end of a language. And let no one be alarmed at the few Latin roots given in these lessons. No knowledge of Latin is presupposed as a preliminary to the study of these pages. The object of these roots, if not at once clear, will become manifest after a short study of the method.

French grammar, as presented in the ordinary text-books, is a mass of arbitrary rules and absurdities. This same grammar, dealt with scientifically, and in its relation to Latin, becomes logical, consistent and full of interest. My former work has done much to destroy the old sophism—"it matters not how one studies, so long as he goes about it with determination,"—a doctrine, the fallacy and absurdity of which, the study of one proposition of Euclid should be sufficient to settle. I trust that this work will not only help further to kill that doctrine, but that it will prove once more what ought now to be known—that there is an easy and a difficult way of doing everything, and that the easy way is the scientific one.

C. T. DE BRISAY.

TORONTO, March 1st, 1896.

NOTE.—Works on Greek, German, Spanish and Italian, similar to this one, are in course of preparation, and will be published shortly.

INTRODUCTION.

IS it not strange that in the last hundred years—which has witnessed such tremendous strides in nearly all the arts and sciences—so little has been done towards facilitating the acquirement of languages? It is strange, especially when we consider the many attempts that have been made in that direction. Books by the score have been written on the subject. Latin, Greek, French and German grammars have been published, until now there are almost as many different text-books on teaching languages—new methods so-called—as there are students of language. Nearly every college can boast of a professor who is the author of a Greek or Latin grammar. And yet what is the excuse for all these works? They are one and all servile copies of the first grammar written two thousand years ago by a Greek named Dionysius Thrax. One author will present the Latin verb first; another the *noun* first and the *verb* last. A third having found by experiment that if a noun and adjective are placed together, they may be more easily mastered than by taking each separately, imagines he has made a discovery which calls for a new work on Latin grammar. A look through the long rows of Greek and Latin grammars, which are to be found at any large second-hand book-store, will be sufficient to convince one that the most important differences in all these works are to be found on their covers.

And what I have just said in regard to the works on Latin and Greek applies, with some modification, to the works which have been coming from the press for the last 50 or 60 years on French, German, Spanish, etc. Since Ollendorff first published his "NEW METHOD OF LEARNING TO READ, WRITE AND SPEAK A LANGUAGE IN SIX MONTHS," books upon books have been published on exactly the same plan, which might all be labelled *Ollendorff*. Some authors have even gone so far as to steal his sentences; and we wonder greatly at this, for Ollendorff's exercises contain the most nonsensical sentences that were ever constructed or imagined by the human mind. Thus, page after page, does he treat us to composition like the following:

"Have you my ass's hay or yours? I have that which my brother

has. Has anyone my good letters? No one has your good letters. Has the tailor's son my good knives or my good thimbles? He has neither your good knives nor your good thimbles, but the ugly coats of the stranger's big boys."

How can we account for any one supposing that trash of this kind would ever acquaint one with a language? The answer is simple enough. Ollendorff and his slavish imitators, like the numerous writers on Latin and Greek grammar, laboured under the mistaken idea that to know the principles of a language—*i. e.*, its grammar, was to know the language itself, and as the meaningless sentences above noticed illustrate principles of grammar just as well as though they had been the utterances of divine wisdom, it is not difficult to understand why they should have been invented by Ollendorff, and later copied by authors who can do nothing original—not even improve on such a sentence as,— "Have you your ugly iron button?"*

But even should we change every one of Ollendorff's sentences and introduce in their place sensible matter (and this has been done), we would still fail to learn a language by such a method, without spending at least half a lifetime at the work.

French is a language which is taught in most of the English schools of America. In the English colleges of this country certainly a great deal of time is spent on the language. Yet how many of that large number who graduate yearly from these institutions of learning have even a fair grasp of French? If we except those students who have lived for some time among French people, and thus learned to speak the language, the number is indeed small.

But it is not necessary to press further this matter. Many writers within the last ten years have demonstrated the absurdity of attempting to learn a language from precepts. Nay more, they have not only torn to pieces the absurd system noticed above, but have introduced new methods so-called, now generally known as "The Natural Method,"

* The following passage is from Mr. Du Maurier's famous novel "Trilby"—"It was Lambert, a youth with a singularly facetious face, who first woke the stillness with the following uncalled for remarks in English, very badly pronounced :—

" 'Av you seen my fahzere's ole shoes?'"

" 'I av not seen your fahzere's ole shoes'"

" 'Then, after a pause,'"

" 'Av you seen my fahzere's ole 'at?'"

" 'I have not seen your fahzere's ole 'at,''"

The meaning and humor of this passage will not be lost to those who have studied even a page of Ollendorff or his imitators.

"The Object Method," "The Conversational Method," or by the names of the authors who claim to have invented them. These new methods, though differing in minor details, are one and the same system of teaching a language, and the correct name for that system—if indeed it can be called a system—is "The Natural Method."

But what is this "Natural Method?"

The reader has probably heard of it at least, if he has not studied it; for of late it has been much advertised, not only by its many authors (for many claim it as their own discovery), but by a host of illiterate men and women who finding themselves unable to make a living at anything else have suddenly developed into "professors of languages."

All that is required to be a successful teacher of French by the "Natural Method," is to be able to speak the language fluently, and the less one knows about English, the more capable and wonderful a teacher is he considered to be. Here is one profession in which ignorance counts for much, and in which learning is at a discount. The ambitious student never seems at all puzzled to understand how a method which is to acquaint him so easily with French, has failed to acquaint his teacher with English.

But let us glance for a moment at the method itself. The professor points to a chair and says, "*C'est la chaise*"; to the door and says, "*C'est la porte*." He then puts the question, "*Qu'est-ce que c'est?*" and the pupil replies, if he can, "*C'est la chaise*," or "*C'est la porte*." The professor opens the door and says, "*J'ouvre la porte*." Then to the question, "*Qu'est-ce que je fais*," the pupil replies, "*Vous ouvrez la porte*"; and so on in this way, using no English at all, the meanings, of words are conveyed to the student through *objects* and *actions*. We see then, why the method has been called the "Object Method." It is certainly in this way that a child learns his mother tongue, and that indeed is the boast that is made for the method by its authors and teachers.

But how does a child learn his mother tongue?

Did the reader ever ask himself how long it took him to learn his mother tongue? He did not learn it in six months. In six years he learned it very imperfectly; and, perhaps even now he may not know it any too well. And yet he followed faithfully all along the "Natural Method." He devoted, not *two* hours a week for six months to the method, but *ten* hours every day of his life for years. Look at the

child in your own home. From early morning till late at night he hears nothing but English spoken around him. Such sounds as, "Don't do that," "Come here, dear," "I'll whip you now," he perhaps hears fifty times a day. It is not to be wondered at that at last he becomes able, not only to understand these sounds, but also to utter them himself. He hears also many other phrases of a different kind, such as, "a strange notion," "a terrible accident," "it's only human nature," etc., but these sounds fall without effect upon his little ears, for though he may repeat many of them, he does so after the manner of a parrot—without the least conception of what the phrases mean. These words represent *abstract ideas*. They are not the names of *objects* which the child sees and feels about him; they do not indicate the relation of these objects to one another; they are not the language of the child, but of the matured mind.

What is the language of the child? The names of common objects (*man, room, door, etc.*), the names of some of the patent qualities of these objects (*big, small, red*), and the names of the common *actions* of these objects (*cries, falls, swings*). No one thinks of saying to a child, "What is your idea of justice?" or "Is consistency a virtue?" although many such phrases as these, children sometimes hear and learn, but which they cannot understand.

Language is then of two kinds—(1) the language which the child learns and speaks, and which even horses, dogs, etc., learn more or less to understand, and (2) the abstract language used by adults, whether educated or not, and of course still more by literary men and women.

If then we are asked by what method does a child learn his mother tongue, we reply that a child, *as a child*, learns but one portion of his mother tongue, and that portion is drilled and drummed into him from morning till night for weeks and months and years. Were a child allowed to hear the human voice but two or three hours a week, it is probable he would know little of his mother tongue at the age of seven or eight.

Does it not seem strange therefore that an imperfect imitation of this *natural method*,—which, like all of nature's methods, is slow and steady, accomplishing its work only in time—should be thought so efficacious a means of teaching a foreign tongue to the adult man or woman already in possession of one or more languages. It is useless to argue that it is the *natural method*. Limit Nature to *time* and she

can accomplish nothing. All the inventions of the age are nothing, if they are not evidences of man's impatience with Nature, and of his unwillingness to follow her slow footsteps.

A child can only learn by the "Object Method." We have not only to teach him a language, we have to teach him to think. He might hear the word "high" a hundred times and attach no meaning to this sound until you have shown him that the picture on the wall which he asks for, is too *high* for you to *reach*. Perhaps even this might fail to convey to him the meaning of the word, and some other meaning for weeks would be given to it—until some day the true meaning of the word would come to him.

But because a child has no other way of learning the meaning of sounds, is this any reason why a teacher, in order to illustrate the meaning of the word *haut*, should run about jumping up on chairs and tables, leaving his pupils in doubt as to whether *haut* means "big," "high" or "crazy?" But if the *object method* is a bungling way of teaching an adult the meaning of words like *haut*, *long*, etc., it altogether fails when it comes to deal with abstract terms. A professor might jump about all day, making signs and faces, and yet fail to convey to his class the meaning of words like *amitié*, *grossier*, *bonité*, and all those abstract terms, which, though excluded from the language of the child, are used by the educated and uneducated alike in almost every sentence.

It need hardly be said that the "Object Method" (or "Natural Method") does not acquaint one with the scientific principles of a language. Grammar is something which the exponents of that method have great contempt for. They refer us to the child again, and say, "a child knows nothing of grammar, and yet he speaks without hesitation."

It is a mistake to suppose a French child knows nothing of grammar. He may not know any grammatical rules, but he knows when to use *un*, and when to use *une*, when *le*, and when *la*, and many other points of grammar, which no student is able to learn by simply hearing French spoken a few hours a week by his teacher.

If it were possible to acquaint a child with more of the principles of a language, while he is learning to speak that language, does any one suppose his progress would not be much more rapid than it is? If it were possible for his young mind to grasp those principles which have to be taught to him later on at school, would not an immense amount

of time be saved? And yet we are told, that to the adult who can grasp and understand these principles, we must not teach grammar until he has first learned the language *naturally* like the child—that is imperfectly, without method and without guide.

There is nothing in grammar to impede one's progress with a language, and everything (when properly taught) to help one in understanding a language. To attempt to learn a language without being guided by any of its principles, is like attempting to build a house without a plan.

Indeed, the Roman language-teachers—the men who taught Greek to the Roman youth—were not long in discovering this fact. In the days of Cæsar, Greek was spoken and studied in Rome far more than French is spoken or studied in London to-day; and it was to facilitate the study of the Greek language that the first grammar was written. Dionysius Thrax was not a philosopher, but a language-teacher. The grammar which he wrote was found to be a wonderful help to the Roman youths, and all who pursued the study of Greek; so much so, that similar works soon followed on Latin grammar—and these grammars have been little improved on to the present day.

Is it not strange, then, that any set of men should now be found advocating a return to a method which the Roman youths and teachers found imperfect and ineffectual, and should despise the very helps which the Romans hailed with delight? It is strange, and yet the fact is easily explained.

When Dionysius wrote his work on Greek grammar, he never intended that Greek was to be studied through it alone. It was meant to contain simply the guiding principles to aid the student in the study of the Greek *language*. And the same may be said of the grammars which followed his. Modern teachers seem to have mistaken the meaning and intention of the ancient grammarians, and instead of following up the teaching of a language by a reference to its principles, they have confined themselves to the teaching of these *principles* using only the language as a means of illustrating them. When a student is taken through long lists of sentences like, *Avez-vous vu le vieux chapeau de mon père. Non, Je n'ai pas vu le vieux chapeau de votre père, etc.*, it is principles of French grammar he is studying, and not the French language.

It will be understood then how natural is the recent movement

against the study of grammar, and how natural it is to imagine that grammar is a hindrance rather than a help to one in the study of a language. To study a language without its grammar is certainly a great deal better than to study grammar without the language to which it belongs; and so, while I cannot regard the "Object Method" as suitable for any but Kindergarten classes, I believe it to be much superior to the absurd system which for so long a time has held a place in our schools.

The way in which my "Analytical Latin Method" has been received by students and teachers, and the gratifying results which have invariably followed the study of Latin by this method, is a proof, I think, that the principles of a language to be understood and appreciated, must be *uncovered* and *seen* in the language itself. Since the publication of that work, I have not found a single student following the method who did not express both appreciation of the beauty and logic of the Latin language, as well as surprise at the short time in which the language could be learned. I do not hesitate, therefore, to adopt this same Analytical Method in teaching the scientific principles of French.

A method for French, however, would not meet the needs of the present day, if it did not, above all else, enable one to speak the language.

And now, what constitutes the difference between *speaking* and *writing* a language? It is this: in writing we have time to think out and compose the constructions we use; when we speak we make use of constructions that are *ready-made*. When you say, "Good morning! It's a nice day!" it must be evident you do not weave this sentence out of the several ideas—*good*, *day*, *morning*, *nice*, etc. The construction was made for you long before you were born, and handed down to you by your parents, and you now use it as a *unified expression*, no more thinking of its component parts than you think of the letters M-A-N when you utter the word *man*.

Now speaking a language is little more than uttering these ready-made expressions. If we say it is the intellectual act of connecting together two or more of these stereotyped expressions, we shall have given a fair definition of what ordinary conversation is.

Listen but for a few minutes to any English person and you will hear expressions like this: "*It's just a question whether*," "*I'd like to know*—

why,” “*He's-here*,” “*He-did-it*,” etc. Now, the intellectual element in conversation consists not in uttering any one of these expressions, but in connecting two or more of them together. And hence it is that we never see a person pause and scratch his head in the middle of one of these ready-made constructions. Never do we hear—“*It's just a-a-question-whether—he did it*,” though we might hear every day, “*It's just-a-question-whether—ah—whether—ah—he did it*.” The mind is exercised in connecting together the two *ideas*, but not in forging together either of the constructions which express those ideas. The two constructions are ready-made, and the mind selects them with as little effort as though they were two single words.

But where are these constructions stored? How are they preserved since they have so little in common with the intellect?

They are preserved in exactly the same way in which any combinations of movements, such as the movements in walking, dancing, playing the piano, juggling, etc., are remembered. The motor nerves and the muscles of the body, are capable of being impressed in such a way that movements which they have once set up, they reproduce with greater ease a second time, and with each reproduction, the *habit* becomes more fixed and stable, until at last the movements are performed automatically, (or with the slightest provocation) and unconsciously. It is for this reason that we often recite verses without knowing what we are saying; it is for this reason that we can use long combinations of words, grammatically constructed, without the slightest effort; in short, it is for this reason that we can speak a language; and fluency of speech varies in proportion as the motor nerves have or have not been firmly impressed with and accustomed to these combinations of movements.*

Now there is but one way to train the motor nerves to these combinations of movements, and that is by practice—by frequent repetition of the same combinations. Before the student may utter with fluency and ease, such expressions as, *Est-ce que vous avez froid aux pieds? Ça me fait de la peine*, etc., he will require to repeat them several times. But with such practice, fluency and ease will certainly result.†

* I have gone more fully into this subject in the introductory pamphlet, on my “Analytical Latin Method.” See chapter on “Motor Memory.”

† It is probable that the lingual nerves are more easily impressed by fixed combinations of movements than the motor nerves of any other part of the body.

Here then is the second principle which we must follow if we wish to master a language—repetition of its fixed constructions.

But there is a third principle, not less important than the two preceding. We have seen how the grammar of a language must be learned, and we have seen how we can speak a language, provided we have the vocabulary. And now, how can we acquire that vocabulary? How are we to remember all these new sounds for objects, actions and qualities? Can they too be handed over to the motor nerves? No; they must be grasped by the intellect.

The acquiring of a vocabulary has always been a serious task for the student of languages. What student has not wished that there might be such a thing as sugar-coated language-pills, to be taken in doses of ten or twenty every night before retiring, and which would leave his mind enriched with as many new words in the morning? If we had but some such invention as that, this nation would soon be a nation of linguists.

As far as I know, words cannot be got into the mind by any such process as that just suggested. I have, however, another method to offer the student which will prove little more of a tax on the memory, and which certainly will be less hard on the stomach.

What are words?

When a new invention is brought out, and the inventor desires to give it a name, does he make a leap in the air, give utterance to some strange sound unheard of before, and adopt this sound as the name of his invention? Of course not; because such a name would convey no meaning to anyone. If no appropriate name exists to describe the invention, a new name is manufactured by means of one or more words already existing, and we say a new word has been *coined*. Now this process of making words out of words, which we see going on to-day in English and French, has been going on since the very birth of these languages. French did not always possess the vocabulary it has to-day. And yet it has *created* now new words. New words have grown, have evolved naturally, or have been consciously manufactured out of old ones, but no new *elements* have been created. Such words as *brassard* (*armor for the arm*), *brasser* (*to stir*), *brassage* (*brewage*), *brasseur* (*brewer*), *brasserie* (*brewery*), *embrasser* (*to embrace*), *embrassade* (*embracement*), etc., are all from the one word *bras*, and would not exist had the parent *bras* not first existed.

I remember some foolish young people, who, dissatisfied with both French and English, because too many persons could understand these languages, resolved to invent a language of their own. They created a few words, but did not get much further, for they soon found out they could not remember their own *creations*. And why was this? Because the sounds they adopted as the names of things, actions and qualities, were barren, lifeless sounds, without meaning. Had nations attempted to make new languages on this principle, they would have failed just as certainly.

Why do we call "to stir" *brasser*, in French. Because it means to move with the *bras*. What does *embrasser* mean? To enfold in the *bras*. And *brassard*? A piece of armor for the *bras*. And from *brasser* we make *brassage*, *brasseur*, *brasserie*, etc.

What a beautiful thing is language! And yet how simple! Out of a single form, what a family of words! How full of life and meaning are these words, and how easily remembered! But curiosity will lead the reader to another question. Where did these root-words like *bras* come from? Did French create them? No; they were transmitted to the Gauls by the Romans. French is simply a development of popular Latin. In fact, it is difficult to say at what period in the history of its development, it should cease to be called *Latin* and termed *French*. Out of about 4,000 Latin words, the every-day vocabulary of the Roman soldiers and the common people of the Roman Empire, have grown and evolved, by the process already described, nearly 8,000 French words. That is to say, 4,000 Latin words have grown to 12,000 in French.

But it is not necessary to know these 4,000 Latin words in order to appreciate fully the 12,000 words which form the basis of popular French. And now let us see why.

We must not forget that Latin, at the time of the dissolution of the Roman Empire, was a fully developed language, just as French is to-day, and that the process of forming words from words had been going on for several centuries in Latin. Thus from the word *pedem* (*foot*), the Romans made *pedica* (*footsnare*), which gave in turn *impedicare* (*to ensnare or fetter*); and these derivations go to make up most of the 4,000 words before mentioned. But as we have little to learn from derivatives, we may pass them over, and instead of referring the French *piège* (*trap*) first to *pedica*, (wl. *h* is only its old form), we may refer

with both
and these
created a
but they
is? Be-
ons and
nations
ould have
means to
d in the
om bras-

Out of
meaning
will lead
like *bras*
mitted to
popular
ry of its
French.
the Ro-
e grown
French
000 in
order to
popular
of the
o-day,
ng on
, the
re (*to*
f the
from
French
refer

it directly to *pedem*. And so if we thus treat French and Latin as one language—and there is no break but time between them—our 4,000 Latin roots will dwindle down to about five or six hundred. It may be important to the philologist to know that certain words are entirely of French growth, and that others existed before the birth of the French language, but for ordinary purposes it matters little whether such a word as *piège* is the direct offspring of *pied*, or whether the Latin *pedem* first yielded *pedica*; for *piège* is *pedica* mispronounced.*

But these 500 or 600 roots which form the basis of Latin have given us more than the 4,000 French words, which have now grown to 12,000. For the Savants of the 16th century finding the French language too poor to express their ideas, rushed headlong into Latin, and taking from that language hundreds upon hundreds of words, used them as French, with scarcely any change in their form and meaning. And since the 16th century classical Latin words have been flowing into French more or less steadily, and at the present day the stream flows on with redoubled energy. Thus it is, then, that while *pedem* has given such forms as *piège*, *piéton*, *empêcher*, etc., it is equally the parent of such words as *pédale*, *bibède*, *expédition*, etc., pure Latin words taken into French, but whose meanings are not seen in the Latin originals, (*pedalis*, *expeditio*), but in the root *pedem*, from which those originals grew. We see then that about 500 or 600 roots have given over 20,000 French words—or almost the whole French language.†

Now, few students will care for such a vocabulary as this; for many of these words are seldom used. If we desired to know them all it would not be a very difficult matter to do so, but we will be satisfied with about a third of that number—and that is more than most writers use in all their works.

Shall we then follow any system in learning these words?

We know that the methods in use at the present day follow no sys-

* We can go still further: a few Low Latin roots are of German origin, and in many cases these German roots have allied forms in Latin; in such cases we can disregard the German altogether, and take the allied Latin form. Thus, *patte* (foot), is probably of German origin, but the German root, *pat*, is the same word as the Sanscrit *pada*, the Greek *podon*, the Latin *pedem*, and French *pied*.

† French, also, has a number of words of German origin, and some learned words of Greek origin. Many of the Latin words which have come into French since the 16th century are used in literature only, but journalism has done much to popularize a large number of these words, and they seem to be replacing many of the older words even in the conversation of the uneducated.

tem—and we also know the result. Who would think of trying to master Euclid's *Geometry* by selecting propositions here and there at random from his system? And yet, have we not seen that words are related to each other by a perfect system? This being so, they cannot be properly understood or even remembered to any great number when learned as isolated sounds.

On the other hand, if we take them in connected groups—in families, if you will—a dozen words can be learned with almost the same effort as one. And 500 families of 12 give a vocabulary of 6,000 words.

When a student is made to memorize *épicier* (*grocer*) before *épice* (*spice*), or *brasserie* (*brewery*) before *brasser* (*to stir*), or *panier* (*basket*) before *pain* (*bread*), he is surely being made to learn a language backwards,—nay, he is being made study a lot of meaningless sounds, void of all interest. On the other hand, to learn a language, not as a child is obliged to learn it, but as the nation made it and learned it, is not a labor, but an exercise, interesting, delightful and above all beneficial.

No doubt the nursery can teach us many interesting facts about language and how it should be learned, but language is not made by children; and he is a narrow-minded philosopher indeed, who would shut himself up in a nursery, watch the persistent efforts of young children to speak, and from these observations alone found a system by which to teach the adult mind a foreign tongue. A whole generation cannot teach us what a language is, and the history of a nation leaves still much untold.

Much stress is laid, by the exponents of the Natural Method, on what they call *thinking in a foreign language*. I do not wish to deny that to a certain extent they enable a student to discard his mother tongue. As far as a few familiar objects are concerned, one can hear the foreign words, and think of the objects they represent, without first thinking of their English names. And the same thing may be said of a small number of verbs and adjectives. But true thinking in a language is more than this.

How many English persons can feel the force and meaning of words like *amitié*, *effronterie*, *grossièreté*, *embellissement*, *agrandissement*, etc.? They may imagine they are thinking in French when they use these words for their conceptions of the English *friendship*, *effrontery*, *coarseness*, *embellishment*, *agrandissement*, etc.; but until they can from the

idea *belle* lead themselves in thought to *embellissement*, from the idea *grand* to *agrandissement*, from *front* to *effronterie*, from *ami* to *amitié*, etc., they will have to lean on English for their abstract conceptions, and do their philosophizing in their own language.

It hardly needs be pointed out that the method followed in this work will lead the students at once to think in French. *Brasse* is a word which when learned with *bras*, has far more force than the meaningless English sound *fathom*, and the English *stir* loses its vigour as soon as *brasser* reveals the image of *bras*; and who is there who will not better appreciate the English *embrace* when he learns that it means to take in the *bras*?

What a dead thing is English compared with this language whose words reveal so beautifully their living elements!

It would be an exaggeration to say that the student, after studying these lessons, would find himself thinking in French when attempting to speak English; but we can safely say at least, that he will, on completing this course, have a scientific knowledge of French, a grander conception of what language is, and a truer appreciation of his mother tongue.

DIRECTIONS FOR STUDY.

The student who pays attention to the three principles laid down in the Introduction to these lessons, will not study French in vain. Let us repeat those principles :

- I. The meaning of French words must be got at, not from the English, but by analyzing the words and observing their roots, except of course, in case of *root-words*, where the meaning may be taken from the English. (*Root-words* only are given in Lesson I.).
- II. Close attention must be paid to the grammatical notes in studying the exercises, and in no case must the notes be learned apart from the sentences to which they refer.
- III. The conversational exercises should be recited frequently, until the constructions become so familiar that they can be repeated mechanically, or almost without any thought of what is being said.*

The pronunciation of French is exceedingly difficult for English students, and the only way to acquire it is by hearing the language spoken. There are many books professing to give exact signs for French pronunciation, but these signs are worse than useless. If the student is a beginner, he should seek the assistance of some one who can speak French. Of course one might learn to read and write the language without learning to speak it, but it is not advisable to do this if assistance with the pronunciation can be had.

No student is so far advanced that he cannot be greatly benefited even by the first few lessons of this course ; and yet few persons there are who will find any trouble in following these lessons.

*The style followed throughout the first four lessons is conversational.

PREMIÈRE LEÇON

La table.	La fille.	La tête.	La fumée.
(<i>tabula</i>)	(<i>fil a</i>)	(<i>testa</i>)	(<i>fumus</i>)

THE TABLE. THE GIRL. THE HEAD. THE SMOKE.

Le bras.	Le nom.	Le pied.	Le cou.	Le champ.	Le feu. (1)
(<i>brachium</i>)	(<i>nomen</i>)	(<i>pedem</i>)	(<i>collum</i>)	(<i>campus</i>)	(<i>focus</i>)

THE ARM. THE NAME. THE FOOT. THE NECK. THE FIELD. THE FIRE.

L'épine.	L'échelle.	L'homme. (2)
(<i>spina</i>)	(<i>scala</i>)	(<i>homo</i>)

THE THORN. THE LADDER. THE MAN.

La fille est (is) dans (IN) le champ. L'homme est dans le champ aussi (ALSO).

Je vois (I SEE) la tête de (OF) l'homme et (AND) le cou de la fille. Je vois aussi dans le champ—

Une échelle, une table et un feu. (3)

L'échelle est sur (ON) la table, et le pied de l'homme est sur l'échelle.

Le feu est sous (UNDER) la table—ah non! le feu est derrière (BEHIND) la table entre (BETWEEN) l'homme et la fille. A présent (NOW) je vois deux (TWO) feux.

L'homme a (HAS) une épine dans le pied. Il (HE) est dans la misère (MISERY). Et la fille, elle (SHE) est dans la misère aussi, car (BECAUSE)

(1) **La FILLE** (feminine), but **le BRAS** (masculine); words ending in any letter but e (silent) are masculine, because derived from words which were masculine or neuter in Latin. In late Latin, the neuter became confounded with the masc. and disappeared, hence we have no neuter in French. Most nouns ending in e (silent) are feminine, being derived from feminine Latin nouns. **Cou**; the Latin l often becomes u in French.

(2) **L'épine**; for the sake of euphony (sound), we write l' instead of la or le, before words beginning with a vowel (that is, a, e, i, o, u, y). So l' HOMME (pronounced l'om and formerly so written), not **le HOMME**, because h is silent, and must be treated as non existent.

(3) **Une TABLE, a table**, but **un FEU, a fire**; use **une** with a feminine noun, **un** with a masc. noun.

elle aime (**LOVES**) l'homme. Je ne vois pas (**I SEE NOT**) l'épine, mais (**BUT**) je vois

**les pieds de l'homme et
les bras de la fille (4)**

Oui (**YES**), je peux voir (**AM ABLE TO SEE**) aussi, entre la fille et l'homme,

la fumée **du feu**. (**5**)

Ah ! à présent (**NOW**) je vois les deux **feux** et la fumée
des (**OF THE**) deux feux. (**6**)

Regardez l'homme; il parle (**SPEAKS**) à (**TO**) la fille. Non; la fille parle à l'homme. Allons (**LET US GO**) parler à **la fille**. Allons parler à l'homme.

Allons **au champ**.

Allons **aux champs**. (**7**)

Ah, nous sommes (**WE ARE**) dans le champ. Mais où (**WHERE**) est la fille ? Où est l'homme ? Où sont (**ARE**) la table, l'échelle, et les deux feux ? Je ne **les** (**THEM**) vois pas. Ils (**THEY**) ne sont pas ici (**HERE**). Ah oui ! Je **les** vois. Voyez-vous cette (**THAT**) fumée ? Cette fumée vient (**COMES**) de (**FROM**) l'autre (**OTHER**) champ. Cette fumée vient **des** (**FROM THE**) feux dans l'autre champ. Eh bien (**WELL**), la fille et l'homme sont là (**THERE**) où (**WHERE**) vous voyez cette fumée. (**8**)

Oui; ils sont là : je suis certain, à présent, que (**THAT**) je les vois : là ! les voyez-vous ? Regardez encore : mais à présent je ne les vois

(4) **Les PIEDS** (plural); we add **s** to a noun in the plural. Of course if the noun happens to end in **s** in the singular (as **bras**), we do not add a second **s**. Observe that **le**, **la** (or **l'**) become **les** in the plural.

(5) **Du FEU** (= **DE LE FEU**); in early French, **DE LE**, became **DEL** (as in Italian), and then **L** softened into **u** (see **cou** Obs. 2) which gave **deu** or **du**. So we now no longer write **DE LE**, but **du**, though the old form **de l'** still persists before words (masc. or fem.) beginning with a vowel, because it is more euphonious.

(6) **Feux** (plural); in early French **x** (and even **z**) was written indifferently for **s** in the plural of many nouns. Hence some words have retained the old style of plural, viz., words ending in **eu** or **au**. **Des**; **DE LES** became **des**, then **des**, so now we never say **DE LES**.

(7) **Au CHAMP** (*to the field*); **à le** in early French became **al**, and then **l**, softened into **u** (see Obs. 5) which gave **au**. The old form **à l'** is only used before words beginning with a vowel (as **A L'HOMME**). **À les**, became **als**, and then **aus** or **aux**. See Obs. 6.

(8) **De** means *from* as well as *of*. **Des**; why not **DE LES** ? see obs. 6. **La**; note the accent, and do not confound this word with **la** (*the*). So too distinguish **à (to)** from **a (has)**.

pas à cause (BECAUSE) de la fumée. Ah, là ! je les vois : l'homme est devant (BEFORE) le feu, et la fille est derrière la table près (NEAR) de l'homme. **Les** voyez-vous ? Ils sont près de nous. Allons dans l'autre champ. Mais regardez

regardez **cet autre champ ;**
ce champ, regardez
cette fille. (9)

Ce champ-ci (THIS FIELD HERE) est grand (BIG), plus grand (MORE LARGE) que les autres champs, plus grand que ce champ-là (THAT FIELD THERE).

Plus grand ? Ah oui, car ce champ-là est très (VERY) petit (SMALL). La fille et l'homme sont dans ce champ-là.

L'homme est grand.
La fille est grande. (10)

Les hommes sont presque toujours (NEARLY ALWAYS) grands ; mais les filles ne sont pas toujours grandes ; elles (THEY) sont presque toujours petites. (11)

Toujours petites ! non, non, cette fille là-bas (OVER THERE) dans l'autre champ n'est pas petite. Elle est grande, très grande, presque aussi (AS) grande que l'homme. (12)

Mais où est-elle à présent, cette grande fille ? Je ne **LA** (HER) vois pas.

Et cet homme, où est-il à présent ? Je ne **LE** (HIM) vois pas.
Je veux (WANT) voir la fille ; oui,

Je veux **la** (HER) voir.
Je veux **lui** (TO HER) parler.

(9) **Cet**, **ce** . . . **cette** ; the old form **cet** contracts to **ce**, except when a vowel follows it (as **CET AUTRE**) ; **cette** of course is the feminine form of **cet** (or **ce**).

(10) **Grand** (masc.) referring to **HOMME** ; but **GRANDE** (fem.) referring to **FILLE**. We add **e** to the adjective in the feminine. In English we say, *a big man*, and *a big girl*, but in French we must make the adjective agree with its noun.

(11) **PETITES** . . . **GRANDS** etc. ; though the **s** is not pronounced here, it must be written, to make the adjectives agree with their nouns.

(12) **N'** *est pas* (= **NE EST PAS**) ; **pas** always takes before the verb the negative particle **ne**, which however contracts to **n'** before a vowel. Whenever the student meets an apostrophe (as **L' J' N' D'**) he may know then an **e** has been dropped for *euphony*.

Je veux voir l'homme aussi :

Je veux **le** (HIM) voir.

Je veux **lui** (TO HIM) parler.

Où sont-ils ?

Je veux **les** (THEM) voir.

Je veux **leur** (TO THEM) parler. (13)

Ah ! je **LA** vois — la petite fille : je **LE** vois — l'homme. Ha ! Ha ! je **LES** vois ! je **LES** vois ! Je peux **LES** voir à présent : je peux **LEUR** parler.

Il y a (THERE IS) un feu dans ce champ-ci. Il y a **de la** (of the = some) fumée dans ce champ-là. (14)

Il y a une fille dans ce champ-ci. Il y a **des** (of the = some) filles dans ce champ-là.

Oui, il y a **des** filles, **des** hommes, **des** tables, **des** échelles et **de la** fumée dans l'autre champ.

Verbe ÊTRE (TO BE)

Je suis	}	Tu es	}	Il est	}	
Nous sommes		Vous êtes		Ils sont.		

(15)

Verbe AVOIR (TO HAVE)

J'ai	}	Tu as	}	Il a	}	
Nous avons		Vous avez		Ils ont.		

CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISE

NOTE. — The student should learn the answers to the questions below, so as to be able to reply without hesitation. It is practice of this kind (for the motor nerves) that will enable him to speak French. The greater the practice, the more fluent and easy will speech become. See Introduction, page 11.

Q. Que (WHAT) voyez-vous dans le champ, Monsieur D—— ?

R. Je vois une table, une échelle, un feu, un homme, etc.

(13) **Lui**, **leur**; notice that **LUI** means **to him** or **to her** (like Lat. Dative, *illi*), and **LEUR** **to them**.

(14) **De la FUMÉE** (of the *smok**) = *some smoke*; we could not say, **IL Y A FUMÉE**. The expression **IL Y A** (*there is* or *there are*) is idiomatic.

(15) These verbs are given here for reference only: they must not be learned by rote.

Q. Qui (WHO) est cet homme, et qui (WHO) cette fille ?

R. Jean est le nom de l'homme, et Jeanne le nom de la fille.

Q. Est ce que (IS IT THAT) l'échelle est dans le feu ? (= is the ladder, etc. ?)

R. Non, Monsieur, l'échelle n'est pas dans le feu. Elle (SHE = IT) est près du feu : elle est devant (IN FRONT OF) le feu, ou derrière le feu.

Q. Est-ce qu'il y a (IS IT THAT THERE IS ?) de la fumée dans ce champ-ci ?

R. Oui Monsieur, il y a de la fumée, un feu, des tables, des échelles, etc., dans ce champ-ci.

Q. Est-ce qu'il y a des filles dans l'autre champ ?

R. Non, Monsieur, il n'y a pas de filles dans l'autre champ. (16)

Q. Est-ce qu'il y a des hommes dans l'autre champ ?

R. Non, Monsieur, il n'y a pas d'hommes, pas de filles, pas d'échelles, pas de fumée, pas d'épines—rien (NOTHING) dans l'autre champ.

Q. Cette fille que (WHOM) vous voyez dans le champ, est-elle plus grande que l'homme ?

R. Non, Monsieur, elle n'est pas *plus grande*, mais elle est presque aussi grande que l'homme.

Q. La voyez-vous à présent ?

R. Oui, Monsieur, je **la** vois. Je peux **la** voir.

Q. Voulez-vous (WISH YOU) **lui** parler ?

R. Non, Monsieur, je ne veux pas **lui** parler, mais je veux **la** voir.

Q. Est-ce que vous avez des filles (DAUGHTERS), Monsieur ? R. Oui Monsieur, j'ai quatre (FOUR) filles.

Q. Sont-elles (ARE THEY ?) grandes ou petites ? R. J'ai deux grandes filles et deux petites filles.

Q. Est-ce que c'est la fille de Monsieur Duval qui est avec (WITH) cet homme dans le champ là-bas ?

R. Non, c'est la fille de Monsieur Dubois. Voici (HERE IS) la fille de Monsieur Duval.

Q. C'est la fille de Monsieur Dubois, qui est près de nous, n'est-ce pas ? (IS IT NOT SO ?) R. Non, Monsieur, voilà (THERE IS) la fille de Monsieur Dubois, là-bas. (17)

(16) PAS de FILLES (*not of girls*), not PAS des FILLES (*not of the (some) girls*) ; in a negative sentence we use de without the article le, la. (Remember that DES = DE LES).

(17) **voici** (= VOIS ICI), used in the sense of *here is*, so **voilà** (= VOIS LÀ), *there is*.

DEUXIÈME LEÇON

NOTE A.—The words which appear in italics in the following exercises, are all from the same root, and though the English equivalents of these words are given (so as to help the student to grasp their meaning), little attention should be paid to the English, but great attention to the French words themselves, in noticing how they are connected in meaning with the *root-word*. Thus on meeting *une brasse*, the student must not think of *FATHOM* but of *deux bras*. So *brasserie* should not suggest *BREWERY*, but a place where men *brassent* *BEER*. In other words, French must be made the medium of thought.

Le Bras (BRACHIUM).

L'homme a deux bras. Avec les deux bras il *embrasse* (il prend dans les bras); il prend (TAKES) une *brassée* (ARMFUL) d'épines. Ce qu'il prend dans les bras est une *brassée*; mais une *brasse* (FATHOM) est la longueur (LENGTH) de deux bras.

Les filles portent (CARRY, WEAR) au bras des *bracelets*. Elles les portent toujours à l'*avant-bras* (FOREARM).

Avec les bras on peut (ONE IS ABLE) *brasser* (TO STIR) le feu; on peut aussi *brasser* de la bière. Dans les *brasseries* (BREWERIES) on *brasse* (STIR) de la bière. Cet homme là-bas est un *brasseur* (BREWER) de Paris.

Les bras des arbres (TREES) sont des *branches*. Cet arbre-ci est très *branchu* (FULL OF BRANCHES). Avec deux branches on peut faire (TO MAKE) un *brancard*. (1)

Le Pied (PEDEM).

L'homme a deux pieds. Il est donc (THEN) un *bipède* et non pas un *quadrupède* (quatre pieds). Nous allons aux champs à pied (ON FOOT); nous sommes des *piétions* (PEDESTRIANS). Cette fille a le pied sur la *pédale* de ce piano, mais cet homme a marché (HAS WALKED) dans un *piège* (TRAP): il est *empêtré* (ENSNARED) et il ne peut pas se (HIMSELF) *dépêtrer*. Ah, Monsieur, un *piège* n'est pas un *marchepied* (FOOTSTOOL). Il y a un *marchepied* devant le *piédestal* (PEDESTAL) de cette colonne (COLUMN). Mais regardez cet homme: il *piétine* (KICKS) de rage. *Piétinez* (KICK), Monsieur, mais n'*empiez* (ENCROACH) pas sur ce champ, car nous avons des *pièges* pour (FOR) *empêcher* (TO PREVENT) cela (THAT).

(1) *Brancard*, a hand-barrow; also the shafts of a cart. Notice also *BRASSARD* (armor for the arm), and *BRASSAGE* (brewage).

Voulez-vous voir cet homme ? Eh bien, *dépêchez-vous* (HURRY YOURSELF). L'homme a des pieds, mais le chien (DOG) a des *pattes*. (2) Voyez-vous ce verre (DRINKING-GLASS) ? Il est *épate* (BROKEN AT THE FOOT). Et voyez-vous cet homme ? Il a des *patins* (SKATES) aux pieds : il *patine* (SKATES) : c'est un *patineur* (SKATER). (3)

Le cou (COLUM).

Vous avez au *cou* un *col* (COLLAR) et non pas un *collier*. (4)

Ce cheval (HORSE) a au cou un *collier* et un *licou* (HALTER). Les filles portent des *collerettes*.

Voilà le *collet* de mon habit (COAT). Je prend (TAKE) cet homme au *collet*—je le *collète* (COLLAR HIM). Cette fille est *decolletée* (BARE AT THE NECK). Voulez vous la *décoller* ? (TO CUT HEAD FROM THE NECK).

Comme ces deux filles s'*accolent* (HUG ONE ANOTHER) ! Elles se donnent (GIVE) des *accolades* (des embrassades). Qui est cet homme qui porte des marchandises à son (HIS) *cou* ? C'est un *colporteur* (PEDDLER) ; c'est un homme qui *colporte* (PEDDLES).

L'homme (HOMO from HUMUS, ground).

Le mot (WORD) *homme* vient (COMES) du latin HOMO. Mais ce mot HOMO vient d'un autre mot latin, HUMUS (terre). Il est donc bien vrai (TRUE) que l'homme est formé de la poudre de la terre. Oui, l'homme est formé de HUMUS, mais il n'a pas toujours trop (too much) d'*humilité* ; il n'est pas toujours trop *humble*. Il est plus *humain* qu' *humble*. Selon (ACCORDING TO) l'étymologie, l'*humanité* ne diffère pas beaucoup de l'*humilité*. Un jour (SOME DAY) vous serez (WILL BE) *inhumé* (BURIED). Il faut être *inhumé* avant que (BEFORE) l'on peut être *exhumé*, n'est-ce pas ?

Voyez-vous ce *bonhomme* (GOOD OLD MAN) près de nous ? Il a beaucoup de *bonhomie* (GOOD NATURE). L'autre là-bas c'est un *homicide* (MURDERER). Cette fille là-bas est trop *hommasse* (MASCULINE). Cet homme lui rend des *hommages* (HOMAGE, HONOR). (5)

Autrefois (FORMERLY) on disait (ONE SAID) "l'*om*," et non pas "l'*homme*," ainsi (THUS), "l'*om* voit," et "l'*om* dit," etc. Aujourd'

(2) **Patte**, the *feet* or *legs* of most of the lower animals.

(3) Note also **UNE DÉPÈCHE** (*dispatch*) EXPÉDIER (*to send on*), EXPÉDITION, etc.

(4) **Col** and **cou** are really the same word. See Les. I., Obs I **Collier**, a collar for dogs or horses; also a necklace.

(5) Note also **HUMILIER** (*to humble*) HUMANISER, SURHUMAIN (*superhuman*), INHUMATION, etc.

hui (TO-DAY) il faut dire (IT IS NECESSARY TO SAY) "l'on voit," et "l'on dit," etc. (6)

La tête (TESTA, *skull*) (7)

Cet homme parle à cette fille. C'est un *tête-à-tête*. L'homme est *têtu* (HEADSTRONG); il est *entêtré* (OBSTINATE). Il veut *étêter* (CLIP TOP OFF) cet arbre.

Le nom (NOMEN).

Vous avez un *nom* et un *surnom*. Ce monsieur se *nomme* Napoléon Duval. Il était (WAS) autrefois un homme de *renom*—il était très *renommé*: aujourd'hui il n'a que (HAS BUT) de l'*ignominie*. Il ne sera pas *nommé* président aux *nominations* demain (TO-MORROW). Il est aujourd'hui le chef *nominal*. Le mot "Jean" est un *nom*—le nom d'un homme. Le mot "bras" est un *nom* (NOUN) aussi; mais le mot "vous" est un *pronom* (pour nom), parce que (BECAUSE THAT) ce mot prend la place du mot "Jean." (8)

Le champ (CAMPUS).

Nous sommes aux *champs*. Comme j'aime la *campagne* (COUNTRY) et la vie (LIFE) *champêtre*! Regardez ces *campagnards* (COUNTRY FOLK). Voici un *champignon* (MUSHROOM OR TOADSTOOL). J'aime beaucoup la sauce aux *champignons*.

C'est ici que le général se *campe* (ENCAMPS). Le *campement* est l'affaire d'un grand général. Ce général est un vaillant *champion*. Mais Messieurs, il faut *décamper* (TO MOVE ON). (9)

La table (TABULA, *a board*).

J'écris (WRITE) sur le *tableau* (BLACKBOARD). Voici une *table*, et voilà une *tablette* (SHELF). Ces filles s'*attablent* (SEAT THEMSELVES AT TABLE) sans (WITHOUT) *tabliers* (APRONS). (10)

(6) **On** VOIT; we use **on** very much in French—in all cases where no particular person (or persons) is referred to. After **si**, **et** and **ou** we generally write **l'on** (**on** with the article) because it is more euphonious. The Germans say **MAN SIEHT**; the English, **ONE SEES**.

(7) The circumflex mark (introduced in the 16th century) serves to mark the suppression of a letter (as *tête* for *teste*, *être* for *estre*). Up to 1740 the Dictionary of the French Academy retained the *s* in words like *tête*.

(8) Note also **IGNOMINEUX**, DÉNOMINATION, NOMENCLATURE, NOMINATIF, etc.

(9) **Champion**, formerly *one who fought on the field*, now *any brave fighter—a champion*. Note also **CHAMPAGNOL**, *field-mouse*.

(10) **Tableau**, *a board*, hence also a *picture* made on wood or canvas. **TABLIER** also means a board on which to play *chess*, *draughts*, etc.

L'épine (SPINA).

Est-ce une *épine* ou une *épinglette* (PIN)? C'est une *épinglette*. Cet arbuste *épineux* (THORNY) est l'*épine-vinette* (BARBERRY-TREE). Voilà l'*aubépine* (HAWTHORN); voici des *épinards* (SPINAGE). Dans ces *épiniers* (THICKET) il y a des feux. Ce bel arbre est l'*épinette* (SPRUCE TREE) du Canada. Examinons le dos (BACK) de cet homme. Voyez-vous l'*épine* (SPINE) du dos, le nerf *spinal* et la moelle (MARROW) *épinière*?

L'échelle (SCALA).

Voici une petite *échelle*—une *échellette*. (11)

Voyez-vous les *échelons* (RUNGS) de cette échelle? Et voyez-vous ces *escaliers* (STAIRS) là-bas?

Les soldats (SOLDIERS) ont *escaladé* (SCALED) cette place. Je suis certain que le steamer fait *escale* (LOWERS ITS LADDER—STOPS) ici.

Le feu (FOCUS).

Je suis près du *feu*. J'aime mon *foyer* (HEARTH).

La *fougue* (FIRE) de ce cheval est terrible. Cet homme aussi est d'un tempérament *fougueux* (FIERY). Est-ce une *arme à feu* qu'il a? Oui, c'est un *fusil* (GUN). Voilà un *fusilier* (FUSILEER). Les soldats vont (ARE GOING) le *fusiller* (TO SHOOT HIM). (12)

La fumée (FUMUS). (13)

Cet homme *fume* (SMOKES). C'est un *fumeur* (SMOKER). Je n'aime pas la *fumée*, mais j'aime le *parfum* (PERFUME). Ce monsieur vend des parfums. C'est un *parfumeur*. Il va *fumiger* (FUMIGATE) cet habit. La *fumigation* est l'action de *fumiger*. On dit *la fumée* du feu, mais *les fumées* du vin. (14)

(11) The affix *ette* denotes *smallness*; thus *ÉCHELLETTE* (*little ladder*), *TABLETTE* (*little table, shelf*), *FILLETTE* (*little girl*).

(12) Notice also **UNE FUSILADE**, **FOCAL**, etc.

(13) **La fumée** does not come direct from *fumus* (which is masc.) but from the French verb *FUMER* (*to smoke*). *FUMUS* was taken into French and became **LE FUM**, but this word later disappeared from the language.

(14) **La FUMIGATION**; abstract nouns (i. e. nouns denoting *actions, states* and *qualities* rather than *things*) in **ton** and **son** are taken from Latin *nous* in **to** (which were fem.) and consequently are feminine. They therefore form an exception to the rule in *Les. I.*, *Obs. 1.*

Verbe ALLER (to go).

Je vais	}	Tu vas	}	Il va	}
Nous allons		Vous allez		Ils vont.	

CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISE.

Qui est-ce là-bas dans le champ ?

C'est un colporteur.

Qu'est-ce qu'il fait là ? (What is it that he is doing there ?)

Je ne sais (KNOW) pas ce qu'il fait.

Qui est-ce donc qui est avec lui ? (15).

C'est la petite fille de Monsieur Duval.

Qu'est-ce que c'est donc qu'elle porte au bras ?

Elle porte un bracelet au bras, et un collier (NECKLACE) au cou.

Et qu'est-ce qu'elle a aux pieds ?

Elle a des patins aux pieds. Jeanne aime ça (cela)—patiner.

Est-ce **son** (HER) nom, ça—Jeanne ! Est-ce qu'elle se nomme Jeanne ?

Oui, elle se nomme Jeanne Duval.

Est-ce **sa** (HER) tête ou **son** (HER) bras qu'on voit là ?

Où ça ? Moi, je vois **sa** tête et **ses** (HER) bras aussi. Ah ! ce sont ses patins que vous voyez. (16).

Allons lui parler ? C'est bien : **allons-y** (TO HER OR THERE).

Qu'est-ce que **tu** fais là, **ma** (MY) petite fille ? (17).

Je patine, Monsieur : voulez-vous patiner aussi ? Regardez donc comme ça va bien (HOW WELL IT GOES). *

Oui, **tu** patines bien, **toi**. Mais moi, je n'ai pas de patins. **Tes** patins sont trop petits pour moi, n'est-ce pas ? Est-ce qu'ils sont à **toi** (TO YOU = YOURS) aussi ces patins-ci ? (18).

Non, ils ne sont pas à moi (= MINE) ces patins-là. Ce sont les patins de cet homme que vous voyez là-bas

(15) **Donc** is frequently thus used for emphasis only, and cannot be rendered in English.

(16) **Sa** TÊTE...**Son** BRAS...**Ses** BRAS ; notice how the possessive adjective agrees with the noun it possesses. Note also that we do not use possessive adjectives when referring to parts of the body, if the meaning is clear without them ; thus, **ELLE A AUX PIEDS** (*to the feet*).

(17) **Tu FAIS** ; in speaking to children or familiar friends, we use **TU** and **TOI** instead of **VOUS**.

(18) **Tes PATINS** ; **vos PATINS** would not be familiar.

Ce monsieur n'est pas **ton** père (FATHER) ?

Oh non ! C'est un petit bonhomme qui vend des épingle, des cols, des bracelets, des tabliers, des parfums, des fusils, et toute sorte de choses (ALL KINDS OF THINGS).

Oui ? Et tu dis (SAY) que ces patins-ci sont à **lui** (TO HIM = HIS) ?

Ils ne sont pas à **moi**, ni (NOR) à **vous** (YOURS) : ils sont donc à **lui**.

Mais tu **en** as une paire pour moi, n'est-ce pas ? (19).

Non, Monsieur, je n' **en** ai pas pour vous. Je n' **en** ai qu' une paire (BUT ONE PAIR). Oh ! J'EN AI, JE N'EN AI PAS, J'EN AI, JE N'EN AI PAS. Pouvez-vous dire ça ?

Oui ; je peux dire ça : mais peux-tu dire ceci (THIS), toi ? C'EST À MOI, C'EST À TOI, C'EST À LUI, C'EST À VOUS, C'EST À NOUS, C'EST À EUX THEM) (20).

Oui, il est facile de dire ça : C'EST LE MIEN (MINE), C'EST LE TIEN, C'EST LE SIEN, C'EST LE NÔTRE, C'EST LE VÔTRE, C'EST LE LEUR. Voilà la même chose (THE SAME THING) (21).

NOTE.—The teacher should enlarge on these conversational exercises, using great care, however, to introduce no new words, and few, if any, new idioms.

(19) The pronoun **en** (*of them* or *of it*) is used very much in French. We would say in English, *you have a pair (of skates, understood)*, but in French we must express the **DE PATINS** or its equivalent **en**, (*of them*).

(20) À **eux**; after prepositions (like **A**, **POUR**, etc.), we use **EUX**, not **LES** or **LEUR**.

(21) **Le mien**, **le tiens**, etc. (*mine, thine, etc.*), Distinguish **le vôtre** (*yours*), and **le nôtre** (*ours*), from **votre** (*your*) and **notre** (*our*).

TROISIÈME LEÇON (1)

[**NOTE.**—The French verb, like the Latin verb, has its personal-endings, although (unlike the Latin verb) it requires its pronoun also. Thus **t**=IL, **nt**=ILS, **s**=TU, **z**=VOUS, **ns**=NOUS. There is no ending for JE.]

Porter (PORTARE) *to carry*; Past Participle, **PORTÉ** (*carried*).

Tu portes, vous portez, nous portons, ils portent, je porte, il porte. (2) Comment (how) vous (YOURSELF) portez-vous, Monsieur ? Je me porte très bien, merci. Et mademoiselle votre fille, comment se porte-t-elle ? (See Obs. 2). Elle se porte très bien aussi, merci.

Ce *colporteur*, que porte-t-il sur son dos ? Est-ce qu'il nous *apporte* (BRINGS) des lettres ? Non, un *colporteur* n'est pas un *porteur* de lettres. Mais cet homme n'est pas colporteur ; il *transporte* des marchandises d'une place à l'autre : il travaille (WORKS) pour *supporter* sa femme et ses enfants : il est le *support* de sa famille.

Qui est cet homme devant notre *porte*, là-bas ? (3) C'est le *portier* (PORTER) : il m'a *apporté* une lettre, mais il a *emporté* (*carried off*) mon *porte-cigares* (CIGAR-HOLDER) et mon *portemanteau* : il faut lui dire de les *rapporter* (TO BRING BACK). S'il ne se *comporte* (BEHAVE) pas mieux (BETTER) il sera *déporté* du pays (COUNTRY). Ah ! s'il n'atait pas hors (BEYOND) de la *portée* (RANGE) de mon fusil !

Ce monsieur à qui (TO WHOM) nous avons parlé est *importateur* de bois (WOOD). L'autre là bas est *exportateur* de vin. Ils ont des vaisseaux (SHIPS) dans le *port* pour *importer* et pour *exporter* leurs marchandises.

(4).

(1) **Leçon** ; in French (as in English) c has the sound of k before o, a or u. By putting a mark called the *cedille* (little z) under c, we give this letter the sound of s.

(2) Compare carefully these forms. They must not be learned in any fixed order. Il *porte* ; all verbs of the er conjugation (PORTER, DONNER, etc.) drop the personal-ending t. Old French said IL PORTET and ELLE DONNET, etc., but these forms are now only used in the *Interrogative*, thus, *porte-t-il ? donne-t-il ?* etc. The early grammarians, not knowing the meaning of this t in the interrogative, thought it was added for the sake of euphony, and so they separated it from the verb by a hyphen.

(3) **Porte**, the *carrying-in place*, hence the *door*.

(4) Note also DES RAPPORTS (*reports*) un RAPPORTEUR, (*tattletale*), L'EXPORTATION, LE TRANSPORT, SUPPORTABLE, INSUPPORTABLE, etc. S'il = SI IL (if he).

Nous n'avons pas encore (YET) parlé du mot *porche* (PORCH) : mais *n'importe* (NO MATTER) ; ce mot n'est pas *important*. Il faut dire cependant (HOWEVER) qu'une *porch*, est une grande *porte*. Un *portail* (PORTAL) est une grande *porte* aussi : un *portail* est donc une *porche*? Ah non ! Monsieur, vous ne raisonnez (REASON) pas juste. Vous ne *remporterez* pas (WILL NOT CARRY OFF) le prix (PRIZE).

Donner (*donare*) ; Past Participle, **DONNÉ** (*given*).

Je vous donne cet habit. Vous me donnez cet habit. Nous vous donnons cet habit.

J'ai donné (*I have given*). **Je donnerai** (*I shall give*.)

Ils ont donné **Ils donneront**

Il a donné **Il donnera** (5).

Tu as donné **Tu donneras**

Vous avez donné **Vous donnerez** (= vous donneravez)

Nous avons donné **Nous donnerons** (= nous donneravons).

Qu'est-ce qu'il vous a donné, ce monsieur ? Il m'a donné un habit. Un habit ? C'est un *don* (GIFT) agréable. Oui, il m'a fait *donnation* de tous ses biens (GOODS). Il m'a insulté l'autre jour (DAY), mais maintenant (NOW) je le *pardonnerai*. Oh oui ! les insultes sont *pardonables*. Moi, je l'**ai** toujours aimé ; je l'aime encore, quoiqu'il (ALTHOUGH HE) s'adonne un peu trop (A LITTLE TOO MUCH) au vin. Oui, moi aussi, je l'**ai** toujours, aimé et je l'aimerai toujours : je l'**ai** pardonné, et je le pardonnerai encore. Je suis certain qu'il ne s'adonnera pas toujours au vin comme ça, (LIKE THAT). Mais dépêchez-vous : où sont les cartes ? C'est à moi à *donner* (TO DEAL). Vous avez perdu (LOST) votre *donne* (DEAL).

Aimer (*AMARE*), **AIMÉ**, *loved*.

Je l'aime beaucoup, ce monsieur. C'est mon *ami* (FRIEND). Il est si *aimable* (SO LOVABLE, NICE). Il fait tout à l'*amiable* (IN A FRIENDLY WAY). Ce monsieur-ci est mon *ami*, mais celui-là est mon *ennemi*. J'ai bien de l'*amitié* (FRIENDSHIP) pour celui-ci (THIS ONE HERE), mais pour celui-là je n'ai que de l'*inimitié* (HATRED).

(5) **J'ai** DONNÉ....**JE DONNERAI** ; notice that the future is the pres. infinitive with the **ai**, **as**, etc. (the verb AVOIR) joined to it. The Romans said HABEO DONNARE (*I have to give = shall give*), HABEO AMARE, etc., as well as DONABO and AMABO (the regular future), and in late Latin the infinitive with HABEO completely supplanted the regular form. Hence early French said **J'AI A DONNER**, **J'AI A AIMER**, etc., which later became **JE DONNERAI**, **J'AIMERAI**, etc. The forms **DONNERAVEZ** and **DONNERAVONS** soon became **DONNEREZ** and **DONNERONS**.

Vous êtes en *amour* (IN LOVE)— je vois ça. Vous êtes énamouré de Mlle. Duval, n'est-ce pas? Ces *amourettes* (LOVE AFFAIRS) ne font pas de bien (DO NO GOOD). Il ne faut pas s'anniracher (TO FALL FOOLISHLY IN LOVE) des petites filles comme ça. Vous êtes trop *amoureux* (AMOUROUS). Et vous avez trop d'*amour-propre* (SELF-LOVE). Là, je vous donne ce petit conseil amical. Êtes-vous *amateur* (ADMIRER) de poésie? Mais voilà *mon amie* Mlle. D—— qui vient. Ah! bonjour, *ma mie* (MY DEAR)! (6).

Fort (FORTIS), *Strong*.

Les hommes sont *forts*. Les femmes ne sont pas *fortes*.

Les hommes ont plus de *force* (STRENGTH) que les femmes. Ce vin m'a *enforci*.

Ça *conforte* (STRENGTHENS) l'estomac, le vin; c'est *confortant*. Ça *fortifié* les nerfs. (7).

Les soldats ont *fortifié* cette place. C'est maintenant une *forteresse*. Voyez-vous les *fortifications*. Ces soldats se *renforcent* tous les jours.

Vous faites des *efforts* pour me faire dire ça, mais ne vous *efforcez* pas (EXERT YOURSELF): vous ne pouvez pas me *forcer* (COMPEL) à le dire (TO SAY IT).

Grand (GRANDIS).

Cette table est très *grande*. Ces deux tables sont de la même (SAME) *grandeur* (SIZE). (8).

Ce monsieur dit que ma fille ne *grandit* pas (GROW BIG), mais il se trompe (DECEIVES HIMSELF) *grandement* (EXTREMELY). (9)

(6) **Mon AMIE** (*female friend*), fem. of **AMI**. But why **MON**? We could not say **ma AMIE** (not euphonious), but why not **m' AMIE**? Indeed, until the end of the 14th century, **ma, sa, ta** always became **m', t', s'** before a vowel, and people said, **m'amie, s'échelle**, etc. In the 15th century, for some strange reason the masc. forms **mon, ton, son** were made to take the place of the logical and more correct forms **m', t', s'**. The expression **m' AMOUR** (*my love*) and **m' AMIE** (now written **MA MIE**) are all that remain of the ancient usage.

(7) Hence also **CONFORT** (*comfort*) **CONFORTABLE**, etc.

(8) **La GRANDEUR** (fem.); Latin abstract nouns in **or** (as **amor**, **AMOUR**, **honor**, **HONNEUR**) were masc., but in passing into French they somehow became fem. The savants of the 16th century tried to restore these words to the gender they had in Latin, but succeeded with three words only:—**HONNEUR**, **AMOUR** and **LABEUR**. This is the 2nd exception to rule in *Les. 1, Obs. 1*.

(9) **Grandement**; most French adjectives make adverbs by the addition of **ment**, just as **ly** is added in English (**LARGE**, *largely*). Note however, that **MENT** is added to the fem. form of the adjective (**GRANDEMENT**, not **GRANDMENT**).

Ces tables-ci ne sont pas bien *grandes*, mais on peut les *agrandir*.
L'agrandissement est l'action d'*agrandir*.

Autre (ALTER,-A). (10).

Un autre homme, une autre femme. (11).

Autrefois on écrivait (WROTE) le mot autre—*altre*. On l'écrit tout autrement (QUITE DIFFERENTLY) aujourd' hui. Le mot est changé, mais non pas *altéré*. (12).

Les excès (EXCESSES) causent de l'*altération* dans la santé (health). La sauce aux champignons m'*altère* (MAKES ME THIRSTY) toujours, mais le vin me *désaltère* (QUENCHES THIRST). Il faut donc prendre le vin et la sauce *alternativement*—i.e., l'un après l'autre. Mais il ne faut pas prendre le vin d'*autrui* (OF ANOTHER PERSON).

Haut (ALTUS,-A) high. (13).

Cette table n'est pas bien *haute*. Elle n'a que (HAS BUT) deux pieds de haut. C'est une bonne *hauteur* (HEIGHT) pour une table, mais ce ne fera pas (WILL NOT DO) pour un *autel* (ALTAR). Le prix (PRICE) des tables *hausse* encore. La rivière (RIVER) a bien *hausse* (RISEN) aujourd' hui. Il ne faut pas *exalter* (PRAISE) cet homme comme ça : il est déjà (ALREADY) trop *hautain* (HAUGHTY). Mais ne parlez pas si *haut* (LOUD) ; il est près de nous. Où est-il ? Il est *en haut* (ABOVE). Monsieur, que faites-vous *là-haut* ? (UP THERE). Que veut donc Votre *Altesse* ? (YOUR ROYAL HIGHNESS). (14).

Bon (BONUS,-A) good.

Cet homme est *bon*. Cette femme est *bonne*. (15).

(10) We have already seen that the Latin *I* becomes *u* in French. See Les. 1, Obs. 1.

(11) Notice that when an adjective ends in *e* in the masc., it does not change (or take another *e*) in the fem.

(12) *Alté·er* means to change from *good* to *bad*, as of the *health*, hence also to make *thirsty* or *dry*.

(13) **Haut**; as a rule Latin words on becoming French, drop *h*—if not always in the spelling, generally in the pronunciation. A few words, however, which had no *h* in Latin, add *h* in French. In such words the *h* is to be pronounced ; thus **HAUT**, not **'aut**.

(14) Note also **ALTITUDE**, **EXALTATION**, **HAUTAINMENT**, etc.

(15) **Bon** (masc.), **BONNE** (fem.) ; adjs. ending in *on* or *ien* (**BON**, **ANCIEN**) double *n* before adding *e*.

J'admire beaucoup sa *bonté*. (16).

Les enfants l'aiment aussi C'est la *bonne* (MAID) Elle a toujours des *bonbons* (SWEETS) pour les enfants. Je ne peux pas dire *bonnement* (EXACTLY) combien elle a d'enfants. Le mot *bien* vient aussi du latin *BONUS*. Ce monsieur se porte très *bien*. Il a l'air *bénin* (KIND). Quelle *bénignité*! Le bon Dieu le *bénira* (WILL BLESS). Cependant (HOWEVER) il n'a pas fait beaucoup de *bien* (GOOD). Son amour est plus fort, plus grand que ses *bienfaits* (GOOD DEEDS). Il m'a fait donation de tout son *bien* (ESTATE). Que fait-il près du *bénitier* (HOLY WATER VESSEL)? Cet homme est *bonasse* (d'une bonté trop simple). Regardez donc comme la mer (SEA) est calme! Cette *bonace* (calme) retarde les vaisseaux

Bel (BELLUS,-A) *pretty*.

C'est un *bel* enfant. C'est une *belle* femme (WOMAN). (17).

Cet enfant est **beau**. (18).

Quel *beauté*! Cette petite fille *embellit* (GROWS PRETTY) tous les jours. Les poètes *embellissent* l'histoire. L'*embellissement* est l'action d'*embellir*. Oh! qu'il fait *beau* aujourd' hui! (19).

Cet enfant est *belot* (SWEET LOOKING). Cette femme est *bellâtre* (PRETTYISH).

Long (LONGUS,-A).

Le tableau est *long*. La table est *longue*. (20).

Cette table a trois pieds *de long*. C'est une bonne *longueur* (LENGTH),

(16) **sa BONTÉ** (fem.); French abstract nouns in *te* (accented) spring from Latin (abstract) nouns in *as* (*as BONTÉ*, from *BONITAS*, *SANTÉ*, from *SANITAS*) and have the gender they had in Latin—feminine. Other nouns ending in *é* (accented) have a different origin and are masc. We saw in Obs. 8 that abstract nouns in *eur* were feminine, though when Latin they were masculine. It is, perhaps, because our forefathers said, *la BONTÉ* (*bonitas*), *la RAISON* (*ratio*), *la PRUDENCE* (*prudentia*), *la CONSTANCE* (*constantia*), *la CULTURE* (*cultura*), etc.—all abstract nouns and fem. in Latin—that they found it more natural to say *la CHALEUR* (*calor*), *la COULEUR* (*color*), etc., than *le CHALEUR*, *le COULEUR*, etc., even though these nouns were in Latin masculine.

(17) **Bel**...**BELLE**; adjs. in *el* or *ell*, double the *l* before adding *e*. See Obs. 15.

(18) **Beau**, the old form *bel* very soon became *beau* (by a change of *l* into *u*, already noticed), and is now only used before a word beginning with a vowel. It would not be euphonious to say *UN BEAU ENFANT*.

(19) **Il fait beau**, literally, *it makes beautiful* = *it's fine weather*.

(20) Adjective ending in *g*, take *u* before the feminine *e* (*LONGUE*) in order to preserve the hard sound of *g*.

mais on peut l'allonger (STRETCH OUT) encore un peu (A LITTLE). Voulez-vous rallonger (LENGTHEN) votre habit ? (21).

Je trouve (FIND) le temps (TIME) long. Il y a longtemps que je suis ici. Pourquoi voulez-vous prolonger le temps ? Je suis l'an (FAR) de chez moi (MY HOME), et je m'y éloigne toujours. (22).

Je peux voir les feux dans le lointain (DISTANCE). Ils sont bien éloignés (FAR OFF) de nous. Prenez (take) cette longue vue (SPY-GLASS) et vous pourrez (WILL BE ABLE) les voir. (23).

Gras (CRASSUS, *thick, fat*), *fat*.

Cet homme est *gras*. Cette femme est *grasse*. (24).

Ce monsieur grasse (il parle *gras*) : c'est un *grasseyeur*. Je n'aime pas le *grasseyelement*. (25).

Aimez-vous la *graisse* (GREASE) ? *La graisse* ? Non, c'est bon pour *graisser* nos bottes (BOOTS), mais ce n'est pas bon pour l'estomac d'un homme. Les Anglais, les Allemands, et les Américains aiment beaucoup la *graisse* et tout ce qui est *graisseux* ; mais nous autres français, nous *engraissons* (GROW FAT) sans manger (TO EAT) de la graisse. Nous *dégraissions* (SKIM OFF THE GREASE) toujours la soupe avant de la mettre (TO PUT) sur la table. Voilà de bon *engrais* (FEED) pour les bœufs (OXEN). (26).

Voilà un *gros* (BIG) homme. Et quelle *grosse* femme ! (27).

Et l'on me dit qu'elle *grossit* (IS GROWING BIGGER) encore (YET). Elle est déjà (ALREADY) d'une *grosseur* horrible. Ah ! je n'aime pas cet homme : il est *grossier* (COARSE). Il agit (ACTS) *grossièrement*. Je n'aime pas la *grossièreté* (COARSENESS).

Qu'est-ce que c'est donc que ça ? Ah ! c'est de la *crasse* (DIRT). Mon fusil est *crassé* et vous allez *crasser* le vôtre. Ah ! que cet homme est *crasseux* (DIRTY) !

(21) **Longueur** ; note the *u* which preserves the hard sound of **g**, and compare **ALLONGER** (pronounced **ALLONJER**).

(22) **Chez**, from Latin *CASA, cottage*, but only used in the expressions **CHEZ MOI**, **CHEZ TOI**, **CHEZ DUVAL**, etc. *Y* (Lat. *IBI*) *there* ; hence **JE M'Y ÉLOIGNE**, *I am getting farther from there*.

(23) Note also **LONGITUDE**, **OBLONG**, **PROLONGATION**, **ÉLOIGNEMENT**, etc.

(24) **Grasse** ; adjectives ending in **s** double this letter before adding the fem **e**. See Obs. 15.

(25) **Grasseyeur**, a person who pronounces the letter **r** as if his throat were clogged up.

(26) **Engrais** means also **manure** to enrich land

(27) Note the doubling of **s** in the feminine. See Obs. 24.

CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISE.

Où es-tu, Jean ? Me voilà (HERE I AM).

Et Jules, où est-il, lui (WHERE IS HE—HE). Le voilà avec moi.

Est-ce son livre (BOOK) que tu as là ? Non, ce n'est pas LE SIEN, c'est celui (THE ONE) que vous m'avez donné hier. Il l'a—LE SIEN (HE HAS IT—HIS).

Eh bien ! rends lui sa lettre. Ce n'est pas sa lettre que j'ai ; c'est LA MIENNE—celle (THE ONE) que j'ai écrite hier. Il l'a—LA SIENNE. (28).

Comment ! c'est LA TIENNE, que tu as là ? Oui celle-ci (THIS ONE HERE) est LA MIENNE ; voilà LA SIENNE.

Et ces lettres-ci, à qui sont-elles ? CELLES-là (THOSE THERE) sont à Mlle. Duval. Ce sont CELLES qu'elle a écrites hier. CELLES-ci sont à moi, CELLES-là sont à Jules, et CELLES-là sur la table là-bas sont à Mlle. Dubois.

Est-ce que ces patins-ci sont à toi aussi ? Non, voilà les MIENS, voilà les patins de Jules les SIENS. Jules, voici LES TIENS. Voilà mes lettres (LES MIENNES) ; voilà LES TIENNES, voilà celles de Mlle. Duval (LES SIENNES), et voici LES VÔTRES (YOURS).

Où sont les patins de Mlle. Duval ? Ceux (THOSE) de Mlle. Duval ? —elle les à—les siens. Ceux-ci ne sont pas à elle, ni ceux-là. (29).

Et Mlle. Dubois, en a-t-elle une paire aussi ? Non, elle n'en a pas. (30).

Etais-tu (WERE YOU) chez Dubois hier ? (See Obs. 22)

Que vous importe ? *what matters it to you ?—what business of yours ?*

Quoi ? que m'importe ? Reponds-moi (ANSWER ME) ! Y étais-tu ?

Oui, j'y ÉTAIS.

Est-ce que mesdemoiselles Duval y étaient aussi ?

Non ; Jules et moi, nous y ÉTIIONS, mais personne d'autre (NO ONE ELSE).

(28) **La mienne.....la sienne**, etc., fem. of **LE MIEN**, **LE TIEN**, etc. We have already seen that adjectives ending in **ien** double **n** before adding the fem. **e**. **MIEN**, **TIEN**, etc., though pronouns now, were once adjectives (used thus : **LE MIEN PÈRE** for **MON PÈRE**). **Celui** ; we should expect the masc. to be **cel**, but notice that it is **celui**.

(29) **Celles** (pl. of **CELLE**). **Ceux** (= **CELS**) ; the masc. pl. is quite regular, **u** being for **l** and **x** for **s**.

(30) **A-t ELLE ? ; so A-T-IL ? , A-T-ON** ; remember that the old form of **a** was **at**. See Obs. 2.

Vous y ÉTIEZ tous les deux (**BOTH OF YOU**) ? Oui, nous y ÉTISSONS tous les deux. (31).

Avais-tu (**HAD YOU ?**) ton livre français avec toi ? Non, mais Jules **AVAIT** le sien. Les Duval n' **AVAIENT** pas les leurs (**THEIRS**).

Comment ! vous n' **AVIEZ** qu' un livre entre vous quatre ? (**THE FOUR OF YOU**).

Nous n' **AVIONS** qu' un livre entre nous cinq. Nous étions cinq (**FIVE**). (32).

SERAS-tu (**WILL YOU BE**) ici demain ? Oui, j'y **SERAI**.

Est-ce que Jules y **SERA** aussi ? Oui, nous y **SERONS** tous les deux.

Les Duval y **SERONT** aussi. **Y SEREZ-vous** ? (33).

AURAS-tu (**WILL YOU HAVE**) ton livre demain ? Oui demain je **AURAI** ; et Jules **AURA** le sien aussi. Ah oui ! nous **AURONS** nos livres demain. Mais je ne sais pas si (**WHETHER**) les Duval **AURONT** les leurs. **AUREZ-vous** le vôtre ? (34).

Oui, j' aurai le mien, et je l' apporterai avec moi. Je vous donnerai une longue leçon demain. Maintenant, mes enfants, il faut vous dire *au revoir*.

(31) **J'ÉTAIS**, **tu ÉTAIS**, **il ÉTAIT**, **ILS (or ELLES) ÉTAIENT**—all pronounced alike, though spelled differently. But note **NOUS ÉTISSONS** and **VOUS ÉTIEZ**.

(32) **J'AVAIS**, **TU AVAIS**, **IL AVAIT**, **ILS AVAIENT**—all pronounced alike. Observe that the ending **ENT** is always silent. Note **NOUS AVIONS** and **VOUS AVIEZ**, and distinguish them from **NOUS AVONS** and **VOUS AVEZ** (**YOU HAVE**).

(33) **SERAS**, **SERAI**, etc.; note that the future is made up of the stem **ser** and **AI**, **AS**, **A**, etc. (the present of the verb **AVOIR**). See Obs. 5.

(34) **AURAS**, **AURAL**, etc.; note the stem **aur** and the endings **AS**, **AI**, **A**, etc. See Obs. 33.

QUATRIÈME LECON

Courir (CURRERE¹), P. P.—COURU (*run*).

Il court, ils courent, nous courons, vous courez, tu cours, je cours.
(1).

Pourquoi (FOR WHAT) ces hommes courent-ils? Ils vont secourir (HELP) leurs amis; ils vont au secours de leurs amis. Au secours! au secours! le courant de la rivière les emporte. Oui, mais ne partez pas (DON'T START OFF) à la course (ON FOOT): prenez (TAKE) ce coursier (COARSER, HORSE). Tout semble (SEEMS) concourir (TO CONCUR) à m' empêcher. Quel concours d' homme! eh bien! dans l'affliction il faut recourir à Dieu. Mais je n' a. pas le temps de discourir (TO DISCOURSE). Il faut parcourir (RUN ALL OVER) la ville (CITY). Demain je veux faire une excursion à la campagne. Après-demain (DAY AFTER TOMORROW) je vais commencer un cours de latin à l' Académie. Mais voilà un courrier (MESSENGER) qui m' apporte une lettre. Cette lettre est l' avant-coureur (le précurseur) de ma mort (DEATH). Remarquez aussi les mots concurrent, concurrence, occurrence, etc.

Finir (FINIS, end¹), P. P.—FINI.

Je finis	Nous fin-iss-ons
Tu finis	Vous fin-iss-ez
Il finit	Il fin-iss-ent. (2).

J' ai fini. Je finirai demain.

Nous avons presque fini la qua'rième leçon. Nous la finirons aujourd' hui. Nous arrivons enfin (AT LAST) à la fin de ce livre (BOOK). Toute chose a une fin excepté ce qui est infini. Et comment peut-on

(1) IL COURT; note the personal-ending **t**, and remember that it is dropped from verbs of the **er** conjugation only (*e.g.* verbs like **DONNER**, **PORTER**, etc.). See Les. III, Obs. 2. **Je cours;** **s** is properly the ending of the 2nd person sing. **tu**, and old French said **Je cour**, **Je vot**, etc. Towards the end of the middle ages, however, **s** was added to the 1st person of all verbs save those of the **er** conj. (hence **je vois**, but **je donne**).

(2) NOTS **FIN-iss-ONS**; note the syllable **iss** which appears between the stem and the ending of the verb in the plural. All verbs of the **ir** conjugation (some 360 verbs) take this syllable with the exception of 22 verbs (**COURIR**, **VENIR**, etc.).

définir (DEFINE) l' *infini* ? Comment peut-on en donner une *définition* ? L'*infini* est *indéfinissable*. Mais plus (NO MORE) de philosophie. Entre l'étymologie et la philosophie il y a une grande *affinité*.

Hi r (YESTERDAY) j'ai parcouru le pays (COUNTRY) jusqu'aux (RIGHT TO) *confins* de la France *afin* (IN ORDER) de vous voir, et aujourd' hui me voilà *enfiné* dans cette petite place.

Autrefois pour mettre *fin* (TO PUT AN END) à une cause on payait (PAID) *une finance* (FINE) ; aujourd' hui les *finances* est l'argent (MONEY) que l'on a.

Mais qu'avez-vous là ? Du papier *fin* (FINE) ? Oui ; et une épingle très *fine* (FINE) : j'ai aussi du *sucré* (SUGAR) *raffiné*. Je viens de la raffinerie. Une épingle, du papier et du sucre ! trois choses qui ont beaucoup d'*affinité* entre eux ! Ah ! vous êtes trop *fin* (CUTE), vous. Et toi, petite fille, tu est trop *fine* aussi. C'est bon d'avoir un peu de *finesse*, mais vous autres, vous en avez trop. Vous êtes plus *finauds* (SLY) que *fins*. Mais il faut *finer* cette leçon : écrivons (LET US WRITE) "FINIS."

La terre (TERRA).

La vie de l'homme sur la *terre* n'est pas longue. La vie sur ce globe *terrestre* est très courte (SHORT). Demain Monsieur D—— sera *enterré* (inhumé). Serez-vous à l'*enterrement* ? Hier j'ai *enterré* dans ce champ de l'or (GOLD) et de l'argent, et aujourd' hui ces diables (DEVILS) l'ont *déterré* (UNEARTHED IT). Voilà un beau *terrain* (GROUND). Est-ce à vous, ça ?

Vous êtes un grand *terrien* (LANDED MAN). Ce vin sent le *terroir* (SMELLS OF THE SOIL).

Nous sommes dans le *territoire* des Allemands (GERMANS).

Qu'est-ce que c'est donc que ça, là-bas ? C'est une *terrasse* (TERRACE). Ces hommes vont *terrasser* ce mur (WALL). Le *terrassement* de ce *chemin* (ROAD) est presque fini.

Qu'est-ce qu'il y a dans cette *terrine* (EARTHEN BASIN). Du 'ait (MILK). Oh oui ! Voilà une *terrine* (BASIN FULL) de lait. Et qu'est-ce que c'est que ce trou (HOLE) dans la terre ici ? C'est un *terrier* (FOX-HOLE OR RABBIT-HOLE). C'est là que le renard (FOX) *se terre*. Allons examiner ce *tertre* (RISING-GROUND). Voilà du *terreau* pour mon jardin. Oui, pour mon *parterre* (FLOWER GARDEN). (3).

Voyez-vous ces vaisseaux sur la mer ? Ils vont *terrir* (COME ASHORE) ici.

(3) *Terreau*; a sort of *manure* formed of decayed leaves and other vegetable matter. *Parterre*, also means the *pit* in a theatre.

La vie (VITA from VIVERE).

Est-ce que Monsieur Duval est encore *en vie*? Qu'est-ce qui le fait *vivre* comme ça? Oh! Duval, c'est un bon *vivant* (GOOD LIVER). Moi, je *vivote* (DRAG OUT AN EXISTENCE) seulement. Oui, mais qu'est ce qui lui donne tant de *vie*? Qu'est-ce qui le rend *si vivace* (LONG LIVED)? Qu'est-ce qui lui donne tant de *vivacité* (LIVENESS). Il est *si vif* (ALIVE, QUICK). Sa femme n'est pas *vive* (QUICK) comme lui. (4).

Ce qui le rend *si vif*, ce qui lui donne cette force *vitale*—cette *vitalité* et cette *vigueur*, c'est la *viande* (FOOD) qu'il mange (EATS). (5).

Au Canada les *vivres* (FOOD) sont fort chers (VERY DEAR) et le vin est hors de prix (BEYOND PRICE). Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un *vivandier*? C'est un homme qui vend des *vivres* (des *victuailles*) aux soldats.

Le soleil (SUN) *vivifie* (donne de la *vie* à) toutes choses. Pouvez-vous *raviver* (rendre plus *vif*) le feu?

Vous allez *survivre* votre femme. Le *survivant* aura tout mon bien. Voulez-vous me payer une rente (INCOME) *viagère* (pour la *vie*)? Les exemples de *longévité* (longue *vie*) sont rares aujourd'hui. Etiez-vous un des *convives* (GUESTS) au festin? Je veux vous *convier* (inviter) à un dîner demain. Les *conviés* (invités) sont mes amis et mes parents (RELATIVES). Aimez-vous ces fonctions *conviviales*? Aimez-vous la *convivialité*? *Vite!* *Vite!* (QUICK) marchez avec plus de *vitesse* (QUICKNESS). (6).

Quatre (QUATUOR).

Un, deux, trois, *quatre*. Le premier, le deuxième, le troisième, le quatrième. Quatre et dix (10) font *quatorze* (14). Quatre fois dix font *quarante* (40). Quatre et vingt (20) font *vingt-quatre*. Quatre fois vingt font *quatre-vingts* (80). Il y a une *quarantaine* (ABOUT 40) de mots qui viennent du mot *quatre*.

Deux est le *quart* (FOURTH) de huit (8), n'est-ce pas? Eh bien! mon bien a *quadruplé* depuis (SINCE) hier. Il me faut un *quartier* de mouton (SHEEP, MUTTON). Avec quatre morceaux (PIECES) de bois (WOOD) on peut faire un *cadre* (FAME). Je veux *encadrer* (TO FRAME) ce tableau. Autrefois tous les cadres étaient *carrés* (SQUARE). Voici un *carré* (A SQUARE). Pouvez-vous *carrer* (TO SQUARE) le nombre dix? Répondez *carrément* (SQUARELY). Voilà un homme d'une belle *carrure* (SQUARE-

(4) **Vive**, fem. of **VIF**; adjectives ending in **f** change that letter to **v** in the fem.

(5) **Viande**, in its broad sense means *food* or that which sustains life, in its narrow sense, *flesh—meat*.

(6) The etymology of **VITE** is doubtful, but seems to be from some Low-Latin form allied to **VITA**. Note also **VITEMENT** (*quickly*), and **VIVEMENT** (*eagerly*).

NESS OF THE BACK). Cette chambre (ROOM) est pavée de *carreaux* (TILES). Je vais vous allonger sur le *carreau*. (7).

Voulez-vous *équarrir* ce morceau de bois. C'est bon (ALL RIGHT), Monsieur, donnez-moi mon *équerre* (RULE, SQUARE) et mon *cahier* (COPY BOOK). Autrefois les cahiers n'avaient que quatre feuilles (LEAVES).

Voilà deux *escadrons* (SQUADRONS) bien armés. Voilà une *escouade* (SQUAD) de soldats. Voici un chef d' *escadre* (SQUADRON OF SHIPS). Remarquez aussi les mots *quadrille* et *carrefour*. (8).

Le Jour (DIURNUS).

Bonjour ! Monsieur. Quel jour du mois (MONTH) avons-nous ? C'est *aujourd'hui* le quatre. Est-ce qu'il faut rester (TO REMAIN) ici toute la *journée* ? (9) Oui, Monsieur. Eh bien ! apportez-moi le *journal* (PAPER). Voici les *journaux* d'hier. (10).

Ce monsieur travaille *toujours* : il travaille *journellement* (DAILY—EVERY DAY). Le voyez-vous ? Il fait son travail *journalier* (DAILY) : il est *journaliste* : il s'adonne au *journalisme* (11).

Est-ce que vous allez *séjourner* (REMAIN) quelques mois à Paris ? Oui j'y *séjournerai* trois mois. C'est un long *séjour* (STAY) que vous allez faire : c'est un beau *séjour* (PLACE TO LIVE) que Paris. (12). C'est *aujourd'hui* que le parlement s'ajourne (ADJOURNS ITSELF). Oui, on va *ajourner* le parlement *aujourd'hui*.

(7) *Carreau* ; a *tile* is generally *square*. Hence also *LE CARREAU*, the *paved floor* or *street*. In cards, *LE CARREAU* = *diamonds*.

(8) *Escadron*.... *ESCADRE* ; a *squadron* generally took the form of a *square*.

Carrefour ; a *square* where several streets cross one another.

(9) *LA JOURNÉE* (*the day long*), notice that the ending *ée* denotes *duration*. So in *BRASSÉE* this ending denotes the *contents of the BRAS*. *Aujourd'hui* = *AU JOUR D'HUI*, *on the day of to-day*.

(10) *Les journaux* (pl. of *JOURNAL*) ; we have already noticed the tendency of *l* to change to *u*. This change is almost certain when *l* is followed by a consonant. Hence, words ending in *l* change that letter into *u* as soon as we add the sign of the plural. But we have also seen that *u* prefers *x* to *s* as the mark of the plural. Hence *JOURNAUX*, *CHEVAUX*, *ANIMAUX*, etc., for *JOURNALS*, *CHEVALS*, *ANIMALS*, etc.

(11) *JOURNALISME* ; the suffix *isme* (from the Latin *ISMUS*) is a masculine-termination ; hence all works like *JOURNALISME*, *PROTESTANTISME*, etc., are masculine. *Journaliste* : the suffix *iste* denotes a trade or profession. Hence words like *JOURNALISTE*, *DENTISTE*, etc., are masculine. These two classes of words form, therefore, an important exception to the rule in *Les. I.*, *Obs. I.*

(12) *SÉJOURNER*.... *SÉJOUR*, etc. ; let the student remember that the meanings of all these words must be gathered from their use in the sentences and from the root-words, more than from the English words, which represent but imperfectly their meanings.

Le Bœuf (BOVEM), ox.

Quel animal est-ce? C'est un *bœuf*. Ces animaux (Obs. 10) sont des *bœufs*. (13).

Ce bœuf *beugle* (BELLOW). Entendez-vous (DO YOU HEAR?) le *beuglement* du bœuf? Aimez-vous le *bœuf* (EEF)? Oui, Monsieur, servez-moi au *bifteck* (BEEFSTEAK) s'il vous plaît (IF YOU PLEASE). (14).

Aimez-vous le *beurre* (BUTTER)? Oui, je veux *beurrer* (TO BUTTER) mon pain (BREAD). (15).

Votre pain est déjà *beurré*. Donnez donc une *beurrée* (A BUTTERED SLICE) à Jules. Allons au *beurrier* (BUTTER DEALER). Allons plutôt (RATHER) à la *beurrerie* (BUTTER FACTORY). Ce *bouvier* (OX DRIVER) vient de la *bouverie* (OX STABLE). Ces petits bœufs sont des *bouvillons* (YOUNG STEERS). Mais ne parlons plus de la race *bovine*.

La base (BASIS) base.

Voyez-vous la *base* de ce piédestal? Voilà la *base* de ce système: c'est la-dessus (sur cela) que je *base* mon système.

Ce terrain est très *bas* (LOW). Cette table est trop *BASSE*. (Les. III. Obs. 24.) Le mot *bas* vient du bas-latin *BASSUS*. Mais ce mot *BASSUS* vient du latin *BASIS* (la base). Est-ce que cet homme est en haut ou *en bas* (BELOW)? Il est *là-bas*. Il agit *bassement* (Les. III. Obs. 9). Mon dieu! quelle *bassesse*! (BASENESS). Qu'est-ce qu'il a donc aux pieds? Une paire de *bas* (STOCKINGS). Est-ce que vous chantez (SING) la *basse*? Non, je ne chante pas du tout (AT ALL). Il est si difficile de hausser et d'abaisser (LOWER) la voix (VOICE). Oui, l'*abaissement* de la voix est une chose assez (ENOUGH) difficile. Regardez donc comme la

(13) **Bœuf**; pronounced *boof*; the plural is pronounced *beu*.

(14) **Bifteck**; a corruption of the English *beefsteak*, but the English *beef* is simply the French *bœuf*.

(15) **BEURRER**; notice how verbs are made from nouns by adding **er**. Verbs are also made from adjectives by adding **ir** (e.g., **GRAND**, **GRANDIR**). That is to say, verbs made from nouns belong to the **er** conjugation, while those made from adjectives belong to the **ir** conjugation. These are the two *living* conjugations of the French language—*living*, because new verbs are being added to them every year. They together embrace about 4,000 verbs (3,620 in **er** and 350 in **ir**), all of which are *regular*, excepting **ALLER** and **ENVOYER** of the **er** conj., and 22 verbs of the **ir** conj. The other two conjugations (which we will consider later) are *dead* conjugations—*dead* because no new verbs are being added to them. They together embrace only 90 verbs, the small legacy Latin bequeathed to French in the beginning of this language.

rivière *baisse* (LOWERS). Oui, je vois ça. Mais parlez plus *bas* : *rabaissez* (LOWER) votre voix. (16).

On dit que le prix du blé (CORN) a *baisse*. Ah oui ! le blé est *au rabais*. (17).

Le Domicile (DOMUS, *house*, *domicile*).

J'ai fixé mon *domicile* à Rome : je suis *domicilié* dans Rome. Je peux voir tous les jours le *dome* de St. Pierre. Est-ce que les affaires *domestiques* vous intéressent ? Oh ! oui, car je suis le *domestique* (SERVANT) chez Monsieur Dubois.

Le chien est un animal *domestique*. Il y a des animaux qui se *domestiquent* facilement.

Voyez-vous cette *dame* (DOMINA) ? Oui, **MADAME**, je la vois : c'est **Madame** Dubois. Et voyez-vous cette *demoiselle* ? C'est **Mademoiselle** Dubois. Je les aime beaucoup, les *dames* et les *demoiselles*. Les *demoiselles* Dubois sont très aimables. Voici **Mesdemoiselles** Morin avec **Mesdames** Pelletier et Girard. (18).

Voilà la *dame* de carreau (THE QUEEN OF DIAMONDS). Aimez-vous le jeu de *dames* (CHECKERS) ? Regardez donc, j'ai déjà une *dame* *damée* (A KING CROWNED). Me voilà à *dame* aussi : *damez-moi* (CROWN ME). Ah ! ce *damier* est trop petit : il nous en faut un autre. Ah ! *dame* ! celui-ci peut faire. (19). Savez-vous que c'est *Dimanche* (DOMINICA, Lord's Day) aujourd'hui ? Qu'est-ce que ça me fait ? Vous voulez toujours nous *dominer* ; mais vous allez vous faire *dompter* (DOMITARE, to tame) : je suis un bon *dompteur* d'animaux. Animal *indompté* (UNTAMED) ! êtes-vous *indomptable* ? Remarquez aussi les mots, *prédominer*, *le domaine*, *domestication*, etc.

CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISE.

Quels noms sont du genre masculin ?

Les noms qui ne terminent pas en **e** muet (MUTE) sont du genre masculin : **LE PIED**, **LE BRAS**, **LE COU**, etc.

(16) **Abaisser** and **BAISSER** have pretty much the same meaning, though the former strictly means *to lower* to something, the latter simply *to lower*. In conversation, *baisser* is the word nearly always heard. **Rabaisser** means *to lower further*.

(17) Note also **BÂTARD**, *low born*, a *bastard*.

(18) **Dame** (DOMINA from DOMUS), formerly applied only to the *mistress* of a *house* or a *lady of rank*, now applied to any *married woman*. **Demoiselle**, formerly a *little lady*, now applied politely to all *unmarried women*. Distinguish between **DAME** and **MADAME**.

(19) **Ah dame !** (O DOMINE, O Lord !) a common exclamation which has lost much of its original meaning. **Damier**, *checker-board*.

Est-ce que cette règle est absolue ?

Non, cette règle présente quelques exceptions. Les noms abstraits en **EUR**, **ION** (ou **SON**), **TÉ**, sont féminins : on dit **la GRANDEUR**, **une EXCEPTION**, **la BONTÉ**. Il y a aussi exception pour quelques autres noms : on dit **la MER**, **la MORT**, **la VOIX**, **la FIN**, **une PART** et **la PLUPART** (*greater part*). (20)

Est-ce tous les noms terminés en **e** muet sont du genre féminin ?

Non, mais la plupart le sont. Nous avons déjà donné quelques noms *masculins* terminés en **e** muet : **un ARBRE**, **un PIÈGE**, **un LIVRE**, **un CADRE**, **du BEURRE**, **du SUCRE**, etc. Il faut remarquer aussi que les suffixes, **age** et **isme** sont des terminaisons masculines. Il faut donc dire **le BRASSAGE**, **le PORTAGE**, **le JOURNALISME**, **le PROTESTANTISME**, etc.

Comment forme-t on le pluriel des noms ?

Pour former le pluriel des noms on ajoute (ADD) **s** au singulier.

Est-ce que cette règle est absolue ?

Non cette règle présente quelques exceptions. Quand le nom est terminé au singulier par un **s**, un **x** ou un **z** (**BRAS**, **VOIX**, **NEZ**), le nom ne change pas au pluriel parce qu'il en a déjà la marque.

Quels noms prennent **x** au pluriel ?

Les noms terminés au singulier par **au** ou **eu** prennent **x** au pluriel. En outre (**BESIDES**) les noms terminés au singulier par **al** prennent **x** au pluriel, parce que le **l** du singulier devient **u** au pluriel : **CHEVAL**, **CHEVAUX**, etc.

ON THE PLACING OF THE ACCENTS.

Words like *le*, *dans*, *pied*, *est*, etc., have but one syllable. Words like *par-lez*, *der-riè-re*, *pre-mier*, *é-pi-ne*, *é-chel-le*, *mi-sè-re*, etc., have two or more syllables. But how do we divide words into syllables ? Why not divide them thus : *ép-in-e*, *mis-èr-e*, *éch-el-le*, etc. ? Because each consonant belongs to the vowel that follows it, not to the vowel that precedes it. In *é-pi-ne*, *p* belongs to *i*, and *n* to *e* ; so in *mi sè-re*, *m* belongs to *i*, *s* to *è* and *r* to *e*. Then why not *pa-rlez*, instead of *par-lez* ? Because *lez* is a complete syllable in itself, and *r* must be added to *pa*. So *é-chel-le*, *der-rie-re*, *fu-sil*, etc. (21) And note that as soon

(20) There are also one or two others which we will note later.

(21) **Par-lez** : when two consonants come together (as in **PAR-LEZ**) one consonant goes with each syllable, except of course where the consonants combine so as to form a single articulation as **CH** in **é-chel-le**. **CH**, **PH**, **TH**, **SH** and **GN** are inseparable combinations, and the letters **R** and **L** likewise combine with most consonants, as **EN-CA-drer** (not **EN-CAD-RER**), **TA-bie** (not **TAB-LE**).

as we add a vowel to a word (as the feminine *e* to an adjective), we disturb the division of the syllables in that word. Thus, *pre-mier*, but *pre-miè-re*, *pied*, but *pié-des-tal*, *fort* but *for-te*, etc.

Now, the letter *e* (unaccented) when it stands alone or ends a syllable has hardly any sound. Thus, in *é-pi-ne*, the *e* in the last syllable is scarcely heard. So *au-tre-ment* is pronounced almost as if written *autr'ment*, and *bras-sé-rie* as if written *brass'rie*.

If instead of ending a syllable, however, the *e* is joined with a consonant, so that the consonant ends the syllable (as in the syllable *chel* of *é-chel-le*, or *der* of *der-riè-re*), then *e* has a broad open sound, and is pronounced with the mouth well open. Note the following: *col-let*, *au-tel*, *ter-re*, *é-pi-net-te*, *pres-que*. (22).

In many words *e* ends a syllable unaccompanied by any consonant, and has nevertheless the open sound above noticed. In such cases, however, it takes a **grave accent**, thus: *mi-sè-re*, *der-riè-re*, (pronounced as if spelt *mi-ser-re*, *der-rier-re*). Note the following: *biè-re*, *bi-pè-de*, *je col-lè-te*, *diffè-re*, *é-pi-niè-re*, *al-tè-re*, *ri-viè-re*, *près*, *très*, *ex-cès*, *a-près*. (23).

E may also end a syllable unaccompanied by a consonant, and have the sound of the English *a* in *safe*, but it then takes an **acute accent**. Note the following: *é-pi-ne*, *é-chel-le*, *don-né*, *ai-mé*, *fu-mé*. Without accents, these words would be pronounced 'pin', 'chell', 'donn', etc. The *é* has the same sound as the *er* of dissyllables; i.e., *aimé* and *aimer* are pronounced alike.

The *e* with a circumflex has also the open sound, because, as we have seen (Les. II. Obs. 7), the circumflex denotes that a consonant has been elided. Note *é-tre*, *té-te*, *em-pé-cher*, etc.

The rule then for the placing of accents is this:—Divide the word into syllables, and if the syllable containing *e* ends in a consonant, no accent will be required. If, however, *e* ends a syllable, it will require a grave

(22) When a word, however, ends in *ez* (CHEZ, PARLEZ) or a word of two or more syllables in *er* (as DON-NER, PAR-LER, POR-TIER, CA-HIER), this *ez* or *er* is pronounced like the English *A* in *safe*. And *s* at the end of a word is not pronounced; nor does it lend any strength to a final *e*, thus, *FORTES* (pronounced like *FORTE*). But *s* in the body of a word lends strength to *e*, giving it the open sound, thus, *PRES-QUE*, *VES-TE*, etc.

(23) **Après**, etc.; since *s* at the end of a word gives in itself no strength to *e*, the grave accent is required to give such words as *APRÈS*, *EXCÈS*, etc., their open sound. Otherwise they would be pronounced *APRE*, *EXCE*, etc. See Obs. 22.

or acute accent (according to its sound), unless it happens to be a silent *e*, as in *brasserie* and *autrement*, when no accent will be needed.

In these four lessons the student has hardly had time to get very deep into French. And yet he has, perhaps, gone far enough to see the difference between a scientific study and the unsystematic and unmethodical efforts which consume so much valuable time in the schools of the present day. In Lesson I. we noticed that the Latin **I** became **u** in French. This fact, unimportant as it perhaps might have appeared when first noticed, has enabled us to understand many other facts. Without understanding the principle of the change of **I** to **u**, such forms as *au* (for *à le*), *du* (for *de le*), *ceux* (for *els*), *eux* (for *els*), *beau* (for *bel*), etc., must have stood out as strange inconsistencies in the language. Without knowing that some principle (and along with it another simple fact—that in old French, **x** was written for **s** in the plural of many nouns) we would have been much puzzled by such plurals, as *chevaux* (for *chevals*), *animaux* (for *animals*), *journaux* (for *journals*), etc., to say nothing of what we would have lost by failing to perceive the relation between such words as *cou* and *col*, *haut* and *exalter*, *alterer* and *autre*, *bel* and *beauté*, etc. So too, since **x** = **s**, we can see the reason for not putting an **s** to the plural of such words as *la voix*, *la croix*, etc.; and the forms *tu peux*, and *tu veux*, instead of being contradictions to the rule that the *personal-ending s* denotes *tu*, are really confirmations of that fact and strictly in accordance with such forms as **LES feux** and **LES dieux**, in which, as we see, **eu** takes an **s** in the form of **x**.

French grammar is not the terrible thing it is made to appear to be in the ordinary English-French text books. The greater part of the rules therein found are the mere inventions of the authors of those books—rules which every educated Frenchman violates every day of his life in speaking and in writing. We do not require a rule for every construction that differs slightly from the English mode of expression. We require rules only for those fundamental principles which run throughout the language, forming the basic laws which give it consistency and coherency.

The advantages too, of the plan of learning words herein followed, over the unsystematic way of learning them at random and as the mere equivalents of English sounds, must be self-evident. It may be possible that the student has had a slight tendency to confound some of these words on account of their apparent similarity ; but if so, let him be assured that this tendency will rapidly disappear as he becomes more acquainted with the suffixes and prefixes which serve to distinguish one word from another of the same root, and to give to that word its particular meaning.

When the student shall have learnt to appreciate the force of such suffixes as *ette* (or *et*), *te*, *ment*, *eur*, etc., he will have little difficulty in distinguishing the meanings of such words as *table*, *tablee*, *tablette*, *bon*, *bonté*, *bonnement*, *grand*, *grandeur*, etc. So too, if he remembers that verbs are formed from adjectives by adding the termination **ir**, and from nouns by adding the termination **er**, he will easily appreciate the meaning of such words as *grandir*, *grossir*, *attabler*, *crasser*, etc., without ever seeing their English equivalents. A language is never a real medium of thought to us, until we can, with its suffixes and prefixes, form words for ourselves. But when we have once learned so to deal with foreign words, whether they be of the French, the German, the English, the Latin or of the Greek language, we have learned to express ideas and shades of meaning which cannot be rendered in our mother tongue, we have acquired a new vehicle of thought, a new power of abstraction, and then indeed can we truly say—*we have learned to think in a foreign language.*
